BAP
T8665
1699a

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. .....

SCB
10419

A True

NARRATIVE

OF THE

Portsmouth

DISPUTATION,

Between some Ministers of the *Presbyterian*, and others of the *Baptist*, Persuasion, concerning the Subjects and Manner of *Baptism:*

Held in Mr. *Williams*'s Meeting-place there on *Wednesday*, Feb. 22. $169\frac{8}{9}$.

The MANAGERS

For the *Presbyterians* were,	For the *Baptists* were,
Mr. *Samuel Chandler* of *Fareham.*	Dr. *William Russel* of *London.*
Mr. *Leigh* of *Newport* in the *Isle of Wight.*	Mr. *John Williams* of *East Knoyle* in *Wiltshire.*
Mr. *Robinson* of *Hungerford* in *Berks*, Moderator.	Mr. *John Sharp* of *Froome* in *Somersetshire*, Moderator.

Transcribed from two Copies taken at the *Dispute*; the one by Mr. *Bissel* Town-Clerk of *Portsmouth*, and the other by Mr. *Samuel Ring.*

Revis'd and Publish'd by Dr. *William Russel.*

The Third Edition.

London, Printed for *J. Sprint* at the *Bell* in *Little-Britain*, 1699.

To the most Honourable Governour,

Major-General ERLE;

And the Honourable

Colonel GIBSON,

Deputy-Governour of His Majesty's Garrison of *Portsmouth*,

THIS

NARRATIVE

Is humbly Dedicated,

AS a grateful Acknowledgment of that Favour you did us, in your Application to his August Majesty, to know his Pleasure whether you might admit of a disputation betwixt the Ministers of the *Presbyterian* and those of the *Baptist's* Perswasion, (of which this is the best Account the *Publisher* could obtain;) whereupon his Majesty, out of his wonted Clemency, as an Effect of

that innate Goodneſs which he hath always manifeſted towards his *Diſſenting Proteſtant Subjects*, was graciouſly pleaſed to let us have His Royal Permiſſion, in anſwer to your Requeſt.

For which Favour, together with the Liberty we enjoy in the free Exerciſe of our Religion, we deſire to lay hold on this Occaſion, to expreſs our Thankfulneſs to *God* and the *King*; *praying for His Majeſty's Health and Proſperity in this World, and that God would vouchſafe to enrich him with a Crown of Glory in the World to come.*

Your Honour's,

to my Power,

William Ruſſel.

To

PROPERTY OF PRINCETON DEC. 1881 THEOLOGICAL

To my much Esteemed and Beloved Brethren in the Lord,

Mr. *THOMAS BOWES*,

Messenger and Pastor of the Congregation of Baptized Believers at *Portsmouth*;

AND

Mr. *JOHN WEBBER*,

Pastor of the Church of Christ at *Gosport* under the same Profession of Believers Baptism in Water: Together with the Congregations to whom they belong:

Wishing your Increase in Grace, and in the Knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that God would add to your number daily such as shall be saved.

Honoured and Beloved Brethren,

I *Have thought meet to make this* Dedication *also to you, because ye were not only eye and ear Witnesses of what past in the* Disputation; *but were privy to all the Circumstances with which it was attended, and were the sole Cause of my being engaged in it. How it was managed you best know, and therefore are proper Judges of the matters of fact related in this* Narrative. *For my own part, I have took much pains, and used great Care and Consideration in the Review of those Papers you sent me from those that wrote down the Dispute, that I might do no Wrong to either Party.*

And herein I have had all the Helps I could obtain both from our Brother Williams, *who was engaged with me in the Disputation; from whom I received (by the hands of Mr.* Sharp, *our*

Moderator) *an Account of those Arguments he offered, and what else he could remember, taken from his own mouth: besides the account I have had by Letters from divers other Persons that were present. All which I have diligently compared, and have also endeavoured (so far as those Accounts and my own Memory would furnish me therewith) not only to give a true Narrative of what was spoken, but also to give our* Antagonists *Words their due weight as well as our own.*

And if there be any thing omitted therein, they must blame themselves, or their own Scribe, and not us. For Mr William Leddel *went to Mr.* Smith *their Writer, and carried our Copy with him, and desired him to compare it with his: He answered that his was very imperfect, it being the first time he was in a* Dispute, *and he could not take it, but some things were left out; and said, that it was not as yet wholly written over. Mr.* Leddel *waited upon him a second time, but could not obtain a sight of it to compare them together, although he was satisfied it was then finished. Now whether he did this of himself, or by Advice from them; is best known to himself. However, it leaves us without blame.*

I know it is not proper for me (who was principally concerned in it) to say much concerning the Dispute *it self: for being made Publick, it's left to every one that reads it to judge for himself. Nevertheless, it may not be amiss to make some few Remarks upon it; because it may fall into some hands who may not well understand the Grounds of the Controversie.*

1. *It is agreed on both sides, That Mr.* Chandler's *Sermons were the occasion of that Offence taken by you, and of the* Dispute *it self; as appears by the* Preliminaries *signed by Mr.* Thomas Bowes *and Mr.* William Leddel *on our part, and also by Mr.* Chandler *and Mr.* Williams *on the part of the* Presbyterians: *as you may see in* p. 3, 4.

2. *The Objections being made against what Mr.* Chandler *preach'd, it had been his proper Work to have vindicated the Truth of his Doctrine against those Objections, by the Authority of Holy Scripture. But instead thereof, he puts us upon it to prove the contrary. But as the learned Dr.* Smith *did well observe,* He that asserts must prove. *And their own* Moderator *did declare, that Mr.* Chandler *had in his Preaching asserted, that Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, but told us we were not to call on him for that* then.

3. *I would make this farther Remark upon it, That the Reason why he took this method was, because he was unable to prove what he had asserted: for in one of his Sermons he thus speaks*; But that I may proceed with the greater clearness, I shall do these things; first, prove from Scripture the Warrantableness of Infant-Baptism, *&c. And to make his Assertion good, he cites the Commission*, Matth. 28. 19. *for the Baptizing the Infants of believing Parents. And argues upon it, that Disciples were to be Baptized*; *and (saith he)* we have a plain Text that such Infants are Disciples, *see* Acts 15. 10. *And when our Saviour saith*, Go make Disciples, baptizing them, *it must be understood of such Infants. Now as to his Pretence from* Acts 15. 10. *we did sufficiently enervate that. And as for the Commission, Mr.* Leigh *doth confess (as well as Mr.* Chandler) *that it is a Command, and that the Command is express'd*, pag. 27. *And further saith, in* pag. 28. We must all confess that Jesus Christ gave Commission to Baptize Believers when at the Age of maturity; but afterwards the Children of those Believers. *Yet when Mr* Chandler *begins to answer my first Argument, he affirms*, That Christ hath no where expressly commanded Infants to be Baptized. *See* p. 6. *And if so, then Infants cannot be intended, either in that Commission, or any other place where there is a Command in Holy Scripture for Baptism. So that he needs no other Confutation than his own Confession, in the presence, as is supposed, of about* 2000 *Witnesses.*

4. *As for their Consequences which they were so desirous to have a Grant from me that I would allow them to make use of; it's very observable, that if they can do any thing that way it's yet to be done; for they did not offer them to us in the Disputation, but have reserved them in their own Breasts, as the* Pope *doth his unwritten Traditions. And how they should think the People should be convinced of the Truth of their Practice, when they tell them there is no express Command in Scripture for it, and pretend only they have some Consequences to prove it by, and yet refuse to tell what these Consequences are, it is beyond my Imagination. I can assure them, those that can take up a Satisfaction in such empty Pretences, are sufficiently prepared to be Priest-ridden, with a witness.*

5. *When they should have proved (if they had known how) that Infants are capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, according to Christ's Commission*; they tell us (*instead thereof*)

thereof) *That Children are accounted so when they first enter the School, and call a School-master for their Voucher. When the very naming of it confutes themselves, because they are so far from being made Scholars by Teaching, that they know not one Letter of the Book, by their own Confession.*

6. I cannot but observe how strenuously they opposed themselves against our way of Baptizing by Dipping; and rejected the Authority of their own Authors, and divers of the greatest Protestant Writers since the Reformation, *who have asserted our Practice therein to be agreeable to the Etymology of the Word* Βαπτίζω, *and the Practice of* John the Baptist, *Christ and his Apostles; and yet themselves can* (*when it is to serve a Turn*) *practise it the same way, by plunging the Person over Head and Ears in Water. An Instance whereof, as I received it* (*well attested from several hands* (*and the Persons own Confession*) *take as followeth.*

To back that Instance of Mr. Williams's *about the Virgin* Mary *and our Saviour in answer to Mr.* Leigh's *Demand, namely, to give him an Instance of one Person that was born of a Believer, and was Baptized when he came to grown years, see* pag. 34, 35. *we can give you an Account of one whose Parent was a Believer when he was born, and Baptized when adult, by Mr.* Earl *the Presbyterian Minister at* Gosport, *by Dipping, being about* 40 *years of Age. And this was done by the Advice of several of their Ministers, particularly Mr.* Chandler *and Mr.* Williams: *His Name is* Joseph Fox; *he is a near Neighbour of ours. And they did it either by the Commission, or, without regard to it, I know not which; that they best know.*

And by another hand I have this Account.

We have also thought fit to acquaint you with the Person, and his Name, who was Baptized by the Presbyterians at Gosport *which is as followeth*: It was Mr. *Joseph Fox,* living in *Gosport*; who being (by our Brother *Duke*) desired to answer him one thing, which was, Whether, when he was Baptized by Mr. *Earl*, it was done by Dipping the whole Body under Water? And he said, it was; and that in the Presence of four Presbyterian Ministers. *This was acknowledged by him to our Brother* Duke *on the* 20*th. of March,* 1698-9, *And we do desire you* (*if you think fit*) *to place it in some part of the* Dispute, *that the World may be acquainted with that Proceeding of theirs.*

Now

Now by this Action of theirs, if they believe it to be according to the Commission, then they justifie our Practice; if they do it for any by-end, without believing it to be according to God's Word, then (as Mr. Calvin *saith) the whole action is but a Sport.*

Now, that Mr. Chandler *can have no other Thoughts of it, doth evidently appear from his own Words: for in his Sermon preached at* Portsmouth, *Nov.* 10. 1698. *he saith,* It is not likely that that God that will have mercy and not sacrifice, would institute an Ordinance so prejudical to the Bodies of Men; and that it's very unlikely that *Dipping*, which whenever it is mentioned, is used as a Token of God's *Vengeance*, should in this Sacrament be used as a Token of his Mercy. Where you read of *Dipping*, you find it mentioned in a way of Wrath and Vengeance. Thus the old World was Dip'd and Drowned for their Sins: God's Vengeance followed them and they sunk as Lead in the mighty Waters. Thus the *Egyptians* were Dip'd and Drowned in the *Red Sea.* Thus the Lord Jesus Christ shall come down from Heaven, to render Vengeance on his Adversaries; cloathed with Garments Dip'd in blood, *Rev.* 19. 13. [*Here Mr.* Chandler *hath rendered that word* Dip'd *to inveigh and ridicule our Practice of* Dipping, *although he could object against it when I gave it for an Instance*] *But he goes on, saying,* You find still *Dipping* represents in Scripture God's Vengeance and Displeasure. And so I say it is very unlikely, that what was always used as a Token of his Displeasure, should in the New Testament be used as a Token of Mercy. So that it is not necessary that *Dipping* be used in Baptism.

To which I give this for Answer.

1. *If it be so as he saith, then it was altogether unnecessary that Mr.* Erle (*by his Consent*) *should dip Mr.* Fox's *whole Body under the Water.*

2. *That it was not done in Mercy to him, thus to Baptize him; but in Vengeance, and as a Token of God's Displeasure.*

3. *That the Baptism practised by* John the Dipper, *and that of Christ and his Apostles, was not an Ordinance instituted of God in a way of Mercy, but appointed for the People in a way of Wrath and Vengeance; for I have given him a cloud of Witnesses, that they did administer it by Dipping the whole Body under the Water.*

4. *By this he doth condemn and ridicule all those learned Protestants I have mentioned; with many others that might be named.*

And the Divines of the Church of England (*as well as we*) *who appoint* Dipping *as the best way of Baptizing* (*and* Sprinkling *only in case of Weakness*) *and was used by them formerly as their frequent Practice; and is asserted by some of their greatest Divines, to be the old and best way of Baptizing; and is to this day the constant Practice of the Greek Church.*

I am also well assured from some other hands, that, upon the 25*th. of* Febr. *last, a few days after the* Dispute, *Mr.* Leigh *said in the Presence of divers Persons, That to satisfie a Scrupulous Conscience he would administer Baptism by* Dipping. *Whereupon Mr.* Williams *askt him if he would do it to answer a Scrupulous Conscience without God's Word? And he answered No. And I have reason to conclude that Mr.* Leigh *may believe that* Dipping *is the right way of Baptizing, whatever he might say in the time of the* Dispute; *because he did say to divers persons, That if it had been in a private Conference, where there had been but a few Persons of a side, he should have made several Concessions, which he was not willing to make in so great an Assembly. And therefore I will not charge these extravagant Expressions of Mr.* Chandler's *upon him*; i. e. *That* Dipping *was always used as a Token of Displeasure. And surely Mr.* Chandler *had mightily forgot himself when he said so; for* Naaman *the* Syrian *was commanded to dip himself, not in a way of Vengeance and Wrath, but in a way of Mercy; and he found it to be so; for he was perfectly cured of his Leprosie thereby. I would advise Mr.* Chandler *to read over* Rom. 2. 1, 2, 3. *and consider how sharply the Apostle reproves such that condemn others, and yet do the same things themselves; and saith,* Thou art inexcusable, O Man, whosoever thou art, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thy self, for thou that judgest, doest the same things.

How can he, or any of them, condemn our Practice, when themselves can do it to satisfie a Scrupulous Conscience, *or,* &c. *And especially Mr.* Leigh, *who confesses it to be according to the Word of God? And Mr.* Erle *hath done it by their Consent.*

I shall now give you an Account from another hand written from Gosport, *in which (after he hath signified his respects to me,* &c:) *he thus saith*; Although they look on your Arguments to be of little weight, yet we think them to be of too great weight for them to answer with all their Cunning. I hope those that were unprejudic'd will receive some Light, though they endeavoured (as much as in them lay) to darken

kenCounsel with their mutinous Carriage. But Truth will be Truth still in spight of all its Opposites; and will shine, though they would cloud it. *This was written after that vain boasting Advertisement of the* Presbyterians *in the* Post-man, *which was very pleasing to their Party at* London, *and made so great a Noise all over the Nation, as if they had gotten some great Victory; although in truth it was nothing so: as will evidently appear by this Narrative. But my Friend proceeds, saying,* I hope this Account I have herewith sent you, will come safe to your hands; wherein you may see some of their Curiosity, whereby they say they have confounded your Sophistry. Four things I observed in their Proceedings, which (to me) condemned their Cause.

I. The want of so much as one bare Instance in Scripture to confirm their Practice of Infant Baptism.

II. When they required an Instance of a Believer's Child Baptized when adult; and promised, when produced, they would give us the Cause; which Instance was given, and yet they persisted in it as before.

III. Their appealing to the People to give their Assent that they were satisfied with Mr. *Leigh*'s Argument from *Matth.* 19. 14. *Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, by holding up their hands; and it was observed there were but few that did hold up their hands in comparison of so great a Multitude; supposed by some not to be one in fifty; and by others, a much fewer number; so that they were far from having the Opinion of the People on their side, by way of Approbation, whatever they may say of themselves; which was not a little Mortification to them.

IV. When they could not obtain it by Right, they would have it be theirs by might. And this was evidenced by their repeated Clamours; which was not (when duly considered) to their Honour.

Besides, There have been two Concessions made since the Dispute, by themselves, which were these:

1. That there was Credit gained to our cause by this Dispute.

2. That there was Truth and Christianity in it.

For my part, I am satisfied in what was said, and so are our Friends, *&c.*

Sir, This is but some; and considering the Procedure was so clamorous, it may be said to be some of the Spoils won

in Battle, where Innocence and Rancour encountred.

I should be glad to hear of your Welfare, and desire an Interest in your Prayers as oft as you go to the Throne of Grace. *Yours, &c.* *Gosport, March* 11. 1698-9.

I will give you an Abstract of another Letter, from a worthy Person in those Parts, directed to me, who was an eye and ear Witness of what past. In which (after Christian Salutations) he saith,

I hope these Lines will find you in Health, after your tedious and uncomfortable Journey, which I hope may bring some Glory to God, notwithstanding the great Rage that the, *&c.* was in. Indeed they had no other shift to save their Reputation, but by casting out a Flood, acting the part of the Serpents hiss amongst the worst. I do understand, several were convinced by their Rudeness; and they are *since* Baptized.

I think it may be convenient to take away the Cloud from the Common People, by exposing what was delivered in the Dispute (to publick view) and by adding that which they would not then hear; I mean that which relates to the manner of Administration You may consider of it. 'Tis pity they should glory in their shame, deceiving the World.

Dear Friend, I thank you for all your Labour of Love. Your Preaching and Behaviour was to me very acceptable, and to all our Friends, *&c.* *Gosport, March* 6. 1698 9.

By these Testimonies you may see, that the Presbyterians *had no Cause to publish what they did to the World, except it were to keep up their declining Reputation.*

After the Dispute *was ended, and I was returned to my Lodging, Mr.* Williams *told me he would go to his Namesake's house to talk with the* Presbyterian *Ministers that were there. I desired him to remember my Love to them, and let them know, that I could dispute with Men and yet love them notwithstanding: but desired him to tell Mr.* Robinson, *their* Moderator, *that I took it very unkindly at his hands, that he should transgress so much as he had done against the Rules of Dispute, and be so abusive as he was, so as to give the Lye (for he said in the midst of the* Dispute, *with a loud Voice,* That is a Lye, *and yet could not make any thing out about it;) and for his Misrepresentation of what I had said, particularly upon that Argument about the Beasts of the Field not being capable, &c.*

And

And when Mr. Williams *came to see me before I left* Portsmouth, *he told me that he had delivered my Message to them: and that Mr.* Williams *the* Presbyterian *Minister did acknowledge that Mr.* Robinson *had exceeded his Bounds: and that he did abuse me in his misrepresenting of me to the People upon that Argument.*

I answer'd, It was well he had acknowledg'd it now; but it had been better if he had done it before the People.

Mr. Williams *the* Baptist *Minister was pleased to communicate this Account to me by Mr.* Sharp *our* Moderator.

Feb. 23. 1698-9. *Mr.* Leigh *and himself being together at Mr.* Williams's *House in* Portsmouth, *there came in Mr.* Erle, *Mr.* Bowler, *and Mr.* Farrel, *three* Presbyterian *Ministers; and there was two other* Baptists *present at the same time. Mr.* Farrel, *in the Presence of the forementioned Ministers, saluted Mr.* John Williams, *the Disputant, after this manner.*

Mr. Williams, *I must tell you, and that not as my own Sentiments only, but as the Sentiments of every one of our Brethren, that what Credit was gained to your Cause, was gained by you.*

Mr. Leigh *asked Mr.* Williams, *whether we did infer from those words, That the Ministers had granted out of their own mouths that we had gained the Cause?*

His Reply was, No, all that we infer from it was this; That it was an implicit Concession, that there was Credit gained to our Cause.

Mr. Leigh *said, How much Credit did we infer was granted by them to our Cause?*

Mr. Williams *said, We do not know the quantity of it.*

Mr. Leigh *replied, Truly it was but a little Credit that was granted out of our own mouths that was gained to your Cause.*

To which Mr. Williams *answered, That if there was a little Credit granted out of their own mouths, then there was Credit gain'd to our Cause, granted by themselves; which was no farther denied by Mr.* Leigh.

But what was spoken by Mr. John Williams *in the* Dispute, *was abundantly shorter than what Dr.* Russel *did then speak. This far as to Mr.* Williams's *Account.*

Notwithstanding all this, whilst they were making these Concessions at Portsmouth, *they let fly an* Advertisement *after Dr.* Russel *to* London, *which was Printed and Published before he got home: for, as Mr.* Williams *said, they knew who had hurt them. Here follows a true Copy thereof.*

The

The Poſt-man, *Feb.* 25. 169⅘.

Portſmouth, Feb. 23. Yeſterday the Diſpute between the *Preſbyterians* and *Anabaptiſts*, was held in the *Presbyterian* Meeting houſe. It began at Ten of the Clock in the Morning, and continued till Six in the Afternoon, without any Intermiſſion.

The Theme of the Diſpute was the Subject of Baptiſm, and the Manner how Baptiſm is to be performed. *Ruſſel* and *Williams* were the Opponents for the *Anabaptiſts*, and Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh* Defendants for the *Presbyterians*. Mr. *Sharp* Moderator for the former, and Mr. *Robinſon* for the latter.

Mr. *Ruſſel* oppoſed *Infant-Baptiſm*, with all the Subtilty and Sophiſtry of the Schools; and was anſwered with good Reaſon and Learning. Upon the whole, it was the Opinion of all the Judicious Auditory, the *Presbyterians* ſufficiently defended their Doctrine, and alſo worſted their Adverſaries, when they came to aſſume the place of Opponents.

We being ſilent, and not uſing the ſame Methods as they did, to ſquirt out fooliſh Advertiſements in common News Papers, *theſe Men grew confident; and upon the* 1ſt. *of* April *following, in the* Flying-Poſt, *they publiſh a long Story, full of Untruths, and ſilly ſquint-ey'd Reflections, not becoming their Learning or Profeſſion; and all to ſupport a ſinking Intereſt. But it appeared ſo manifeſtly partial, that there ſeemed to be little or no credit given to it, except by ſome few of their own Party.*

For although they were ſo civil to give themſelves the Title of Maſter, *they grudged to ſpeak ſo honourably of their* Opponents. *And in the ſecond Paper they ſay, one Mr.* William (*by ſome called* Dr.) Ruſſel *of* London, *&c.*

All that I ſhall ſay to it is this; As I am a Miniſter of Chriſt, and of the Churches, I can (through the Grace of God) bear all the Indignity and Contempt they can put upon me; if I, by ſo doing, can but do good to Souls, and bring the leaſt Tribute of Honour to my Lord and Maſter thereby. I thank God that he enabled me to count the Coſt before I was ordained to the Work of the Miniſtry; and therefore, if Reproaches, yea Bonds and Afflictions, abide me, it is no more than I looked for.

But what Reaſon theſe Men have to refuſe to give me the civil Title of Doctor, *I know not, neither do I care. But this I know, that many years ſince, I was not only admitted as* Maſter of Arts, *but took my Degree of* Batchelor in Phyſick, *and*

was

was after that Created a Doctor in Physick *of the famous University of* Cambridge, *and also admitted by universal Consent to be a Member of the Senate there; and that not as some have suggested, as if it had been only* ex gratia. *Yet these Men, even whilst I was in* Portsmouth (*as well as since*) *have reported among the People there, that I was* Russel *the Mountebank, a Man that hath been dead several years. They thought (perhaps) by such Artifices to lessen the Peoples Opinion of me. But by making me little, they make themselves the less, in that such Giants as they would have the People believe them to be) should not be able to conquer such a Pigmy as they have represented me in the Eyes of the Vulgar.*

They have also reported, That I am a Hackney Disputant, *and that I refused to come down to* Portsmouth *under thirty* Guinea's; *but that at last I was prevail'd upon to take Twenty. I did not trouble my self whilst I was at* Portsmouth *to confute them in it, because our Friends there knew how to do it themselves; for they knew the Report to be altogether groundless and false. But seeing I have this opportunity, I think fit hereby to tell the World, That I did not so much as demand one farthing of them for my Journey, neither before nor after. For all that are throughly acquainted with me know, that I do neither Preach for Hire, nor Divine for Money, as some of them do; but as I have freely received, so I desire freely to give; believing that ought to be left to the free Benevolence of the People.*

But that I may do Right to our Friends at Portsmouth *and* Gosport, *I do acknowledge that of their own free good Will (without asking) they did pay my Coach hire, and bear my Charges; which, as they thought it was the least they could do, so I can truly say, it was the most I ever expected.*

I shall close this Epistle, with giving the World an Account of the Occasion of this Publication.

There were two things that moved our Friends thereto.

1. *Their Noise and Clamour they made in the time of the Dispute; which hindred the People from hearing what was said especially, when they were pinch'd upon an Argument.*

For which Reason, it was thought convenient to publish it, that what they could not be permitted quietly to Hear, they may have the benefit to Read without Interruption; and so have leisure to consider it.

But 2dly, *The principal Cause thereof, was these Advertisements they sent all over the Nation, to misrepresent the*

Dispute,

Dispute, *and blind the eyes of the Unthinking about it. Whereas this Publication will set the matter in a true Light, and let all Men see that they had neither Scripture, nor any good Consequences deduced from thence, to prove their Practice, either with respect to the Subjects or Manner. And therefore when the People shall see that they have neither Command nor Example for their Practice, I hope it will be a means to convince them of the Unlawfulness thereof; and that they will not dare for time to come to practise a humane Tradition in the room of an Ordinance of Jesus Christ: remembring what our Lord said of the Jews of old,* In vain they do worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men, *Matth. 15. 9. And in Mark 7. 8.* For laying aside the Commandment of God, ye hold the Tradition of men. *And then hear what* Paul *saith,* Colos. 2. 20, 21, 22. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the Rudiments of the World; why, as though living in the World, are ye subject to Ordinances. (*Touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using*) after the Commandments and Doctrines of men?

Now the God of Peace, that brought again from the Dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the Sheep, through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his Will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. So prays,

Your Brother and Fellow-Labourer

in the Work of the Gospel,

William Russel.

The Occasion of this Disputation: *And how Dr.* Russel *came to be ingaged therein; According to the Account received from* Gosport *and* Portsmouth. *The Occasion was this:*

THE Congregation of Baptized Believers at *Gosport*, were so blessed with Success in their Ministry, that in a short time they had gathered Twenty Members, very worthy Persons, who were added to them by Baptism. Many others were amazed and put upon Enquiry. This startled the Presbyterian Party, because divers of them were of their Number, either Members or Benefactors; and they began to fear the Issue thereof.

Whereupon *Mr. Sam. Chandler*, of *Fareham*, about five or six Miles from *Portsmouth*, a Presbyterian Minister, whom they much esteemed for his Learning, was procured to come and Preach up the contrary Doctrine, first at *Gosport*, and afterwards at *Portsmouth*, upon *Thursdays*, on purpose (as was supposed) to put a Stop to this so hopeful a Beginning amongst the Baptists, and hinder their Progress therein. And this was managed by him and his Admirers in such a manner, as was to the Grief of such as truly fear God in those Parts. For it was given out, that *Mr. Chandler* would not only prove Infant Baptism from Scripture-Testimony, and answer all the Objections of the Baptists against it; but also sufficiently furnish his Hearers with Arguments to defend their Practice.

And in the Prosecution of this his Design, he took occasion to make his Excursions, wherein he spake very diminutively of those in the *Ministry*; representing them as Persons ignorant of, and unacquainted with the Holy Scriptures. He also ridiculed and mis-represented the Manner of their Performance of this Holy Ordinance as it represents a Burial and a Resurrection, wherein upon *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. he makes too bold with the manner of our Lord's Burial, and the Apostles Application thereof to Holy Baptism. He might have been pleased to

have wounded the poor Baptists through the Sides of some other Person than so great an Apostle.

He also did greatly extol the Practice of Infant-Baptism, and the Use and Advantage of it to them, beyond those of riper Years; and did inveigh against their manner of Practice with most severe Reflections. Upon this, the Presbyterian Party began to triumph over the Baptists, and boasted, that what *Mr. Chandler* had said upon that Point was unanswerable.

Whereupon, when this last Sermon was to be Preached, wherein he was to shew his great Skill in Answering our Objections: *Mr. Bowes*, and divers other Brethren of both the baptized Congregations, went and heard him. When he had done. *Mr. Bowes* desired leave to speak, and in a modest and Christian-like Manner, did enter his Objection against what *Mr. Chandler* had spoken: and upon a meeting betwixt themselves, they did mutually Agree, That the Points in Difference should be publickly disputed at *Mr. Williams* his *Meeting-house* in *Portsmouth*; and that *Mr. Chandler* and *Dr. Russel* should be the Disputants.

As touching *Dr. Russel*, his being ingaged in it, it did not arise from any desire in himself to be concerned in it; but from the pressing Importunity of his Friends.

The *Church* at *Gosport* being newly constituted, and being more particularly concerned (as the thing was circumstanced) and supposing that all this Stir and Noise was chiefly designed against them, did first make their Application to him for his Assistance. And in the Name of the *Church*, a Letter was sent to him by one of their worthy Brethren, wherein they express themselves after this manner.

To our esteemed Brother *Russel*, we of the *Church* of *Christ* at *Gosport*, send Greeting.

WE being under a Pressure of Conscience, having of late had the great Ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ, (viz. that of Believers Baptism in Water) inveighed against, and ridiculed by one of the Presbyterian Ministers (Mr. Chandler by Name;) and being much grieved that the Ordinance of Christ should be thus triumphed over, and trodden under Foot: and hoping you have so far ingaged your self in Christ's Cause, and that God hath given you Abilities to defend it, we don't only Beg, but Require your Personal Presence, and desire your Assistance to defend that Sacred Ordinance, &c.

He also received several other Letters, Signed by the Ministers, and other Private Brethren, to press him to it.

He did send them word, that it was his Opinion, it would be the best way for *Mr. Chandler* and himself to exchange some Letters betwixt them in the first place, to try the strength and length of their Weapons; and thereby prevent a Publick Disputation, if possible. But when they let him understand that the Matter was too far proceeded in, and so circumstanced, that nothing less than a Publick Dispute could decide it, he then consented to answer their Request therein, because (as they had signified to him) the Glory of God, the Honour of his Truth, and the Good of Souls, was eminently concerned in such a Publick Defence, especially considering that the Presbyterian Party had given out, that we were afraid to meet them: But I shall detain you no longer from the Dispute it self; an Account of which follows.

For the Presbyterians.	For the Baptists
Mr. Samuel Chandler, of *Farehum.*	*Dr. William Russel*, of *London.*
Mr. Leigh, of *Newport* in the *Isle of Wight.*	*Mr. John Williams*, of *East-Knoyl* in *Wiltshire.*
Mr. Robinson, of *Hungerford*, Moderator.	*Mr. John Sharpe*, of *Frooms*, in *Somersetshire*, Moderator.

An Account of the Disputation held at Portsmouth, February *the* 22d. 169⅞.

THE Disputants going to the Place of Meeting, between the Hours of Nine and Ten in the Morning, having took their Places, *Dr. Russel* spake to this Effect.

Gentlemen Forasmuch as the Work we are going to engage in, is a Part of Religious Exercise; It is my Opinion, we ought in the first place (as is usual upon such Occasions) to be seeking God by Prayer; that his Presence may be with us, and his Blessing upon our Endeavours.

The Motion being accepted, *Mr. Chandler* began the Meeting with a short Prayer, which being ended, the Questions and Preliminaries agreed upon, were read, which are as followeth;

Whereas by Mr. Chandler's *late Preaching on the Ordinance of Baptism, several Persons have taken offence; and upon desire of Satisfaction, it's mutually Agreed between us, whose Names are*

under-written ; That these Two Points be Amicably Disputed in the following Order, with Relation to Manner, Time, and Place ; as hereafter expres's'd, viz.

Que. 1. Whether according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Adult Believers are only the proper Subjects of Baptism : and not Infants ?

Que. 2. Whether the Ordinance of Baptism as appointed by Christ, is to be Administred by Dipping, Plunging (or) Overwhelming only, and not otherways ?

Agreed, the Disputation be held at Portsmouth *in Mr.* William's *Meeting-Place, on* Friday *the* 10 *of* February *next ensuing (if God permit) beginning at Nine in the Morning. And if in case the Providence of God should so Order, That either Party should fall sick, or any other unavoidable Circumstance happen ; that then the Time shall be deferr'd to another Day, to be agreed on by the Parties concern'd, not exceeding a Fortnight after ; provided a Weeks Notice be given thereof before the* 10*th. of* February. *Also Agreed, The Parties-Disputants be Mr.* Samuel Chandler *of* Fareham, *and Dr.* William Russel *of* London ; *or any other Persons in either of their Steads, supposing them Ordained Ministers ; and each Disputant to choose a Moderator.*

The Disputation to be Managed Regularly, with strict Regard to the two above recited Subjects : And if the Moderators shall see fit, during any interval of the Disputants for Refreshment, that two other Persons go on with the Dispute, until they reassume it.

Portsmouth, December, 23*d.* 1698.

Samuel Chandler.
Francis Williams.

Here follows *Mr. Chandler's* Apology to the People.

My Friends, It is not out of Vanity or Pride, I appear in this Place upon this Occasion at this Time : Most of you know, and I suppose many of you have heard, that in the Course of my Lecture in this Place, I have Discoursed of the great Principles of Religion ; and having explained the *Creed,* and the *Lord's Prayer,* I came to give an Account of the Two Sacraments of the *New Testament* ; and therein was unavoidably concerned to speak to those Truths that are contradicted by these Gentlemen here present.

Those that heard me, know that I was very Modest in expressing my self in this Controversie: But a bold and confident Challenge was given me, which I knew not how to refuse ; unless I would betray the Truths I believe in my Conscience, or confess my self not able to vindicate them. And accordingly these Men have sent for some Assistance to oppose us in this Matter.

I

I desire these things may be handled with a great deal of Calmness; that we may discourse of things as becomes Christians. And as we have the Favour of the Government both Civil and Military, so we may give them no occasion to repent of allowing us this Liberty.

And also I desire that nothing may be done unbecoming this place, where we usually meet together for the more immediate Worship of God. And I would have you join with me in this Petition; *That God would grant his Truth may take place.*

He then repeated the Questions to be Disputed, and said, These are the Two Articles we are to Dispute of at this Time. We Deny, and they Affirm.

Then Dr. *Russel* said, Gentlemen, you know I was not present at the drawing up of the preliminaries, and therefore I think it may be necessary, before we enter upon the Disputation, to know wherein we agree about the first Question, and wherein we differ; that we may not discourse about those Things wherein we are Agreed.

I do suppose, by the stating of the Question, That you do own that Adult Believers are the proper Subjects of Baptism. And if you do, I would desire you to declare your selves herein.

Mr. *Chandler* said, He did own that Adult Believers were the proper Subjects of Baptism, but not the only proper: Infants were to be baptized also.

Dr. *Russel*. Then you own our Practice to be right.

Mr. *Chandler*. Yes, if they have not been Baptized in their Infancy; then they are to be Baptized upon Profession of their Faith, when they come to Years.

Dr. *Russel*. You suppose they are to be Baptized by Virtue of some Commission; and that it is by the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Mr. *Chandler*. Yes, I do so.

Dr. *Russel*. I suppose you expect I should be Opponent first.

Mr. *Chandler*. Yes, that was Agreed.

Dr. *Russel* If therefore I prove that Infants are not the proper Subjects of Baptism, you will allow that I perform what I have undertaken, we having no other Subjects in the Question but Adult Believers, and Infants.

Mr. *Chandler*. Yes, we do allow it.

Dr. *Russel* Then I will undertake to prove, that Infants are so far from b[illegible] the proper Subjects of Baptism, that they are not the S[illegible]jects of it at all.

And

And now I would know how we shall Dispute; whether by Reading the Commission, and making an Inference therefrom, and proving that (if we are not agreed about it) from some other Text; or what way we shall proceed in.

Mr. *Chandler.* You must do it Syllogistically; and therefore form your Argument.

Dr. *Russel.* My Argument is this.

Arg. 1. If Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to Baptize Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ

But Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to Baptize Infants;

Ergo, The Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Mr. Chandler. I distinguish here upon your Antecedent. If you mean that Christ hath not expresly commanded Infants to be Baptized; then I deny the Consequence of your *Major.* For Christ hath no where expresly commanded Infants to be Baptized.

Dr. *Russel.* If you will insist upon that, I can easily prove it. For some Persons are expresly commanded to be Baptized in the Commission: Infants (by your own Confession) are not expresly commanded to be Baptized either in the Commission, or elsewhere: But I have neither the Word Commanded, nor expresly Commanded in my Argument; and you must Answer to my Argument.

For I agree with you, that Infants are no where expresly commanded to be Baptized.

Mr. Chandler There is no need of that; but those of your Way will not allow us to prove it by consequence.

Dr. Russel I say, that it's no where required: If you prove it any way required, it shall suffice.

Mr. Chandler. If you will allow good Consequences drawn from Scripture, I will deny your *Minor.*

Dr. Russel. Then you must suppose that Christ hath required some of his Ministers to Baptize Infants.

Mr. Leigh. We distinguish between consequential Truths, and expres Words.

Dr. Russel. So do we: But I hope our Lord's Commission about Holy Baptism, is delivered in expres Words, and not consequential. The Term in my Argument is very lax, I do not there say Commanded, but required; and if you prove the Baptism of Infants any where required by Christ, it is sufficient.

Mr.

Mr. Chandler. Will you allow genuine Consequences drawn from Scripture?

Mr. Leigh. Will you allow good Scripture Consequences in this Case, or do you expect plain Scripture Words?

Dr. Russel. What need is there of so many Words about this? Certainly *Mr. Chandler* is bound to fix upon some Answer to my Argument. I say again, the Term I use admits of any Proof; he is not thereby obliged to produce any express Command, if he can do without it; if he prove that Christ hath any way required it, it will suffice.

Mr. Leigh. Gentlemen, you that are Notaries, pray observe how ambiguously he expresses himself.

Dr. Russel. I think I express my self plainly enough, when I tell you, that if you prove it any ways requir'd, I will allow it.

Mr. Robinson, their Moderator, saith, Will you allow this of Consequence, or not?

Dr. Russel. Let us not thus stumble at the Threshold, how often must I tell you, that if you can prove it any way required by Christ; prove it either by Consequence, or which way you will, if you do but prove it, I will allow it. But you must remember that you are to prove it according to Christ's Commission, (for those are the Terms in the Question) and I believe you will find a difficult Task to do that by Consequence.

For suppose an Embassador should declare to the Prince to whom he is sent, That his Master hath given him Authority, by his Commission, to negotiate with him about such a particular matter that he shall name, and that he is charged to do this in his Master's Name and Stead. If when his *Credentials* are produced there is no such thing mentioned therein, he cannot expect the Prince should give credit to him therein, when he had told him before, it was a Part of his Master's Commission (which is our Case:) And his alledging only consequential Proofs after that, will not serve his turn. But if you think you can do it by Consequences, you may try your Skill, with all my heart, so you do but prove it required according to Christ's Commission; which is the thing in Question between us.

Mr. Chandler. What, from the Commission?

Mr. Robinson the Moderator cries out to *Mr. Chandler,* Hold! *Dr. Russel* must prove it by an universal Negative.

Dr. Russel. Then *Mr. Chandler* must deny some part of my Argument, which I have not yet been able to prevail with him to do.

Mr. Chandler. I deny the *Minor.*

Dr. Russel.

Dr. Ruſſel. By denying the *Minor*, you ſay that Chriſt hath ſome where required ſome of his Miniſters to baptize Infants.

Mr. Chandler. By good Conſequence.

Dr. Ruſſel. Then I will make good my *Minor* thus: If Chriſt hath any where required any of his Miniſters to baptize Infants, it's ſomewhere ſo recorded in the Holy Scriptures:

But it's no where ſo recorded in the Holy Scriptures:

Ergo, Chriſt hath not any where required any of his Miniſters to baptize Infants.

Mr. Chandler. What do you mean by being recorded?

Dr. Ruſſel. I hope you know what the word Recorded ſignifies. I mean any where ſo written.

Mr. Chandler. To this I anſwer, by diſtinguiſhing again. If you mean by being Recorded in Scripture, being Recorded in expreſs Words, I deny your *Major*; but if you mean by Conſequence, I deny the *Minor*.

Dr. Ruſſel. If you do but prove it recorded, it is ſufficient.

Mr. Chandler. I deny your *Minor*.

Dr. Ruſſel. Then you ſay it's ſomewhere ſo Recorded in Holy Scripture. I therefore argue thus,

If it be any where ſo recorded in Holy Scripture, *Mr. Chandler*, or ſome other Perſon is able to ſhew it.

But neither *Mr. Chandler*; nor any other Perſon whatſoever, is able to ſhew it.

Ergo, It is not any where ſo recorded in Holy Scripture.

Mr. Chandler. I deny your *Minor*.

Dr. Ruſſel. Hold Sir, it is an univerſal Negative. You muſt give your Inſtance where it is ſo written. I appeal to your Moderator.

Mr. Robinſon. You muſt prove it ſtill. Suppoſe *Mr. Chandler* cannot give an Inſtance, nor no body in the Company; you cannot thence infer that none in the World can.

Dr. Ruſſel. This is in Effect to give away your Cauſe, when there are ſo many Men of Parts and Learning preſent; if none of them are able to give us one Inſtance from Scripture for Infant-baptiſm, we cannot expect that any body elſe ſhould.

Beſides, I would deſire thoſe Honourable Perſons and others in this Aſſembly that underſtand theſe things, to conſider that I am not fairly dealt with, and that I am under a great Diſadvantage, not having other learned Perſons to aſſiſt me as *Mr. Chandler* hath, and yet am forced to anſwer two or three at a time. But to proceed, I do affirm, that it being an univerſal Negative, he ought to give his Inſtance, and I demand it of him; and till he doth, my Argument ſtands good.

Mr. Chandler

Mr. *Chandler*. This is only a Trick to turn off the Opponency.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. What do you talk of a Trick? I hope you are able to give one ſingle Inſtance of what is your daily Practice.

Mr. *Leigh*. You do this to turn the Opponence upon Mr. *Chandler*.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. If Mr. *Chandler* will ſay he can give no Inſtance, I will urge it no further.

Here Mr. Chandler *was going to ſpeak, and* Mr. Leigh *hindred him.*

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Sir, why do you hinder Mr *Chandler* from ſpeaking?

Mr. *Chandler*. Becauſe you would turn the Opponency upon me.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. I intend no ſuch thing. When you have brought your Inſtance, after I have ſpoken to it, I will then go on with the Opponency.

Mr. *Leigh*. You can bring no Argument can throw the Opponency upon him like this.

Mr. *Robinſon*. You muſt know that according to all the Rules of Logick, you are to prove your Propoſition. For you univerſally affirm it, though in Form it runs negatively. You ſay no Perſon can give an Inſtance in Scripture whereby we baptize Infants: How do you prove this?

Dr. *Ruſſel*. I never yet knew that an univerſal Negative was an univerſal Affirmative. This is to ſay any thing, tho' never ſo contrary to Truth, I wonder at it that you ſhould take the matter upon you thus by turns; eſpecially that you ſhould take upon you to be a Diſputant, whoſe Work is only to be a Moderator. Is this civil Treatment to a Stranger that comes ſo many miles to meet you?

Mr. *Robinſon*. I muſt not ſuffer the Queſtion to be alter'd. Mr. *Chandler* is Reſpondent; you put the part of an Opponent upon him, I muſt not allow it: Do you prove your Queſtion.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Mr *Chandler* (I underſtand) hath ſignified to the People in his Preaching, that there are plain Scriptures to be brought for the proof of Infant-Baptiſm, and now is the time for him to produce them: I urge it upon him to aſſign but one Inſtance, and you will not ſuffer him ſo to do.

Mr. *Leigh*. 'Tis not Mr. *Chandler*'s Sermon, it is the Queſtion before us that you muſt regulate.

Dr. *Ruſſel* If you ſay you have no Scripture proof for Infants Baptiſm, I have done. But why muſt you prevent Mr. *Chandler*?

I hope here are ſome Honourable Perſons and others that underſtand the Nature of this Controverſie, and they may reaſonably expect that thoſe who have made ſuch a Noiſe about it, can give ſome tolerable Inſtance for it; and if they will do that, we will proceed to examine it.

Mr *Robinſon*. There are many here know how that Mr. *Chandler* hath aſſerted and proved that Infants are the Subjects of Baptiſm; but you are not to call on him for that now. You did (by your Friends) undertake to prove the contrary, and it reſts upon you ſo to do.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. I have already prov'd the contrary, and my Argument will ſtand good till you give your Inſtance.

Mr. *Robinſon*. If you will change Sides, Mr. *Chandler*, you may admit this Trick.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Can you (at other times) boaſt of ſo many plain Scriptures for your Practice, and now you are brought to the Teſt about it, you are not able to produce one; what will the People think of you?

Mr. *Leigh*. I will undertake in any Diſpute Philoſophical or Divine, in this manner immediately to turn the Opponency upon the Reſpondent. When I cannot prove the Aſſertion, I will preſently ſay, if you can bring any ſolid proof for your Practice, it is true, if not, falſe. And I appeal to the Moderator, whether it be not his Buſineſs to keep the Diſputants to the Rules of Diſpute.

Mr. *Robinſon*. The Moderator is to regulate them if they tranſgreſs Bounds; but you have groſly tranſgreſſed: I appeal to any that underſtand Logick, whether this be ſufferable for him thus to turn the Opponency upon Mr. *Chandler*.

Then Dr. Smith *ſtood up and ſaid*, If I muſt ſpeak, then by your Leave, according to what I always underſtood, He that aſſerts muſt prove.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Then they having aſſerted that Infants are the Subjects of Baptiſm, they are to prove their Practice, eſpecially when they are forc'd upon it by an Univerſal Negative. We deſire but one ſingle Inſtance, and they will not aſſign it.

Mr. *Robinſon*. No; you are to prove your Argument.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. I have done that already, and therefore if Mr. *Chandler* will confeſs he hath no Inſtance to give, I will proceed to a new Argument.

This Mr. Chandler *refuſed to do, and yet would not give his Inſtance.*

Dr. *Ruſſel*. If Mr. *Chandler* can give no Inſtance, here are divers other Miniſters, Gentlemen of *Parts* and *Learning*: Have none

none of them an Instance to produce? If you thus refuse to produce it, the People will think you have none to give.

Notwithstanding this, none of them could be prevailed upon to do it, although they were call'd upon, and challenged to give any one Instance (where it was so written) if they could.

Whereupon Dr. *Russel* spake to this Effect; Gentlemen, It may be you think I have but one Argument; if you will say no more to this, I am not willing to tire out the Auditory, I will therefore proceed to a new Argument.

But take notice (by the way) that my first Argument stands good, till you give your Instance to the contrary.

Arg. 2. If Infants are not capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Men, then they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.

But Infants are not capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Men.

Ergo. They cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.

M. *Chandler* repeats the Argument, and then saith, Here if you mean by being made Disciples, actual and compleat Disciples, I deny your *Major*: But if you mean such as are entred into a School and given up to Instruction, then I deny your *Minor*.

Dr. *Russel* repeats his *Major*, and desires Mr. *Chandler* to tell him what he denies in it. For (saith he) my Words are plain, to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. *Robinson.* Mr. *Chandler* distinguishes between Compleat and Incompleat Disciples.

D. *Russel* But what then doth he mean by denying my *Major*?

Mr. *Robinson.* He denies, that they that cannot be made compleat Disciples, are not intended in the Commission.

I hope the Reader will observe how often Mr. *Chandler* was at a loss, and Mr. *Leigh* and Mr. *Robinson* were forc'd to help him out with their Distinctions and equivocable Expressions.

Here Dr. *Russel* (seeing they would not be brought to give any direct Answer) turns his Hypothetical into a Categorical Syllogism.

Whosoever are uncapable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission?

But Infants are uncapable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men?

Ergo. They cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.

Now let Mr. *Chandler* tell me what he means by being made Compleat, or Incompleat Disciples by the Ministry of Men (according to my Argument) if he can.

Mr. *Chandler*. I mean by Compleat Disciples, such as are actually capable of Learning: By Incompleat such as are entred in such Places in order to be taught. We send Children to School before they know a Letter.

Dr. *Russel*. My Argument speaks not of such, but of those who have Understanding, and are capable to be made Actual Disciples which Infants are not.

Mr. *Chandler*. That such as are so capable are the only Subjects of Baptism; you are to prove it.

Dr. *Russel*. Then you deny the *Major*.

Mr. *Chandler*. Yes, as to your Hypothetical Argument.

Dr. *Russel*. If you had done this before, you had saved your self and me much trouble. Then I prove it thus.

If our Lord in that Commission given for Holy Baptism, hath commanded his Apostles, that were Men, to make Disciples by their Ministry, and after that to Baptize them, then the Consequence of the *Major* is true.

But our Lord in that Commission given for Holy Baptism, hath commanded his Apostles, that were Men, to make Disciples by their Ministry, and after that to Baptize them.

Ergo. The Consequence of the *Major* is true.

Mr. *Leigh*. I distinguish thus: They may be entred into the Church in order for Learning, and so they are Disciples before Baptism: Yet in a more visible Sense they are made Disciples by Baptism.

Dr. *Russel*. Then you suppose Infants not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. *Chandler*. Not solemnly invested.

Dr. *Russel*. We are not talking of that; the Question betwixt us is, Whether they are capable to be made Disciples by the the Ministry of Men. Will you assert that?

Mr. *Leigh*. We assert they are Disciples, as Children of Believers, before Baptism.

Dr. *Russel*. This is nothing to the purpose, but to spin out time. Mr. *Chandler* or Mr. *Leigh* should have answered to my Argument, which neither of them have done. For if Infants are Disciples simply, as being Children of Believing Parents, before Baptism (as Mr. *Leigh* saith), then it is done without any Ministerial Instruction; and therefore is so far from being an Answer to my Argument, that it is a meer Evasion.

I therefore argue thus upon them.

If Infants are not the Subjects of Teaching, according to Christ's Commission, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism by that Commission.

But

But Infants are not the Subjects of Teaching, according to Christ's Commission.

Ergo. They are not the Subjects of Baptism by that Commission.

For what our Lord hath joined together, no Man ought to separate.

But our Lord hath joined Teaching and Baptizing together.

Therefore no Man ought to separate.

And it is further manifest, That our Lord did not command his Father to make Disciples by some secret Work of his; but he commanded his Apostles (that were Men) to make Disciples by their Ministry; and that is the Point you are to answer to.

Mr. *Robinson.* He denies they are uncapable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men,

Dr. *Russel.* Then by the way take notice, that he grants my *Major* to be true; that unless they are capable to be taught by the Ministry of Men, they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism. I shall therefore proceed to the proof of my *Minor.*

If Infants have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil, then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

But Infants have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil.

Ergo. They are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. *Chandler.* You trick all this while. I told you by Infants being Disciples, I meant their being solemnly invested by Baptism.

Dr. *Russel.* You still mistake, we are not speaking of their Investiture, but of the Perquisites of Baptism: And it is evident from what I have said said, that those that are truly Baptized according to Christ's Commission (which is the thing we are upon) must first be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. For the Commission in *Mark* 16. 15, 16. is a Command to his Apostles to go into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature, and that such of them as were made Disciples by their preaching, they should Baptize. And in *Matth*, 28. 19. They are commanded to Disciciple all Nations, and to Baptize such of them whom they had made Disciples by Teaching.

Now when I have shewed you, how that Infants not being capable thus to be made Disciples, they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in that Commission; then you grant the Consequence of the *Major*; and by denying my *Minor*, you say they are capable. And

And when I have brought another Argument to prove my *Minor*, you then evade it by an indirect Answer.

Sir, you are bound to give a direct Answer to my Argument.

Mr. *Chandler*. I deny the Consequence of your *Major*.

Dr. *Russel*. By so doing you say, though they have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil, yet they are capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, How can this possibly be true?

Mr. *Leigh*. You will not allow of Compleat and Incompleat Disciples

Dr. *Russel*. What is this to my Argument? Pray let Mr. *Chandler* fix on something.

Mr. *Chandler*. I say if you mean Incompleat Disciples, I deny that they are uncapable to be such.

Dr. *Russel*. How often must we have this distinction repeated to keep us from the Point in hand. We are now upon this, Whether Infants have Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil; which is the *medium* I bring to prove the other by? Why do you not answer to that?

Mr. *Chandler*. They have no Knowledge, yet are capable of being Incompleat Disciples.

Dr. *Russel*. If by Compleat, you mean perfectly so, I know not of any such Christian in the World. But I hope this doth not hinder, but there may be Real and Actual Disciples of Christ, made so by the Ministry of Men, and fitted for Holy Baptism. But I proceed to the proof of my *Minor*.

If the Gospel in the Ministration of it was appointed to inform Men what is Good, and what is Evil, and Infants have no Knowledge to discern betwixt Good and Evil (as Mr. *Chandler* hath been forced to confess) then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

But the Gospel in the Ministration of it was appointed to inform Men what is Good, and what is Evil, and Infants have no Knowledge to discern betwixt Good and Evil, as Mr. *Chandler* hath been forc'd to confess:

Therefore they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. *Robinson*. When Mr. *Chandler* hath distinguished, you must put it into a Syllogism, else you will still confound it.

Dr. *Russel* answers, Have I not put it into an Argument, and you will not suffer him to answer it? If you think he hath not sufficiently done that already, let him do it again, and tell us what he means by it if he can.

Mr. *Chandler*. I mean one designed and given to Learning solemnly engaged to it, dedicated to the Work, as a Child entered

entred into a School before he understands one Letter; this is Incompleat; Compleat is to be made so by Learning.

Here Dr. *Russel* would have spoke, but was not permitted, but broke in upon.

Mr. *Leigh.* I appeal to any, whether a Child sent to School to a Master or Mistress; given up by the Parents, and accepted by them; whether the Notion of a Scholar be not grounded on such a Relation?

Dr. *Russel.* I speak of Actual Disciples, made so by Teaching; are these such, who (by your own Confession) know not one Letter of the Book? These are Incompleat Scholars indeed, Mr. *Leigh.* I believe there is a Schoolmaster here; let him speak whether such be not immediately Scholars.

Upon this, Mr. *Ridge* the School-master stood up and said, Upon the Parents Dedication, and the Masters Acceptation, and the Payment of Entrance-money, we do look upon him as a Scholar. Whereupon there followed a general Laughter.

Dr. *Russel.* I appeal to this Assembly, whether my Argument did not express such that were made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. What therefore is the Reason of your making such a noise and stir about such being accounted Scholars so soon as they enter the School, before they know one Letter of the Book. Are these made Scholars by Teaching, when they have never learned, nor cannot learn; because they have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil: And yet this is the case of those little Infants you pretend to baptize.

Mr. *Chandler.* We allow they are not capable of Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil, nor of being made compleat Disciples.

Dr. *Russel.* Then the Consequence necessarily follows that Infants are not at all intended in the Commission of our Saviour, *Matth.* 28. 19.

Mr. *Robinson.* Put it into a Syllogism.

Dr. *Russel.* There is no need of that, for Mr. *Chandler* hath granted every part of my Argument.

For 1. He hath granted that Infants have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil.

2. That (according to my Argument) Infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. And then it must unavoidably follow, they are not intended in Christ's Commission.

Mr. *Leigh.* How Sir! Did we say Incompleat Disciples are not in the Commission?

Dr. *Russel.* That hath been sufficiently spoke to already; I shall therefore proceed to a new Argument.

Arg 3. If the the Apoſtle *Paul* did declare all the Counſel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptiſm of Infants to be a Goſpel Inſtitution according to Chriſt's commiſſion; then it is no Goſpel Inſtitution, nor any part of the Counſel of God, nor profitable for the Church of God.

But the Apoſtle *Paul* did declare all the Counſel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptiſm of Infants to be a Goſpel Inſtitution, according to Chriſt's commiſſion.

Ergo, It is no Goſpel Inſtitution, nor any part of the Counſel of God, nor profitable for the Church of God.

Mr. *Chandler*. Your Argument is long.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Not ſo long, nor ſo hard to be underſtood.

Mr. *Robinſon*. Such long Arguments are never admitted in any Diſputation.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Let Mr. *Chandler* ſpeak to the Argument.

Upon this, Mr. *Chandler* finding himſelf unable to anſwer it, notwithſtanding he had two or three Prompters to inſtruct him, he quitted the Place of a Diſputant, and Mr. *Leigh* deſir'd to take it up, which was admitted him, upon condition he would ſpeak to that Argument, which he promiſed to do.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny that the Apoſtle *Paul* did never declare Infant-baptiſm to be a Goſpel Inſtitution.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Then you deny my *Minor*, which I thus prove.

If the Apoſtle *Paul* hath ſo declared it, it is ſomewhere to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament.

But it is not any where to be found in thoſe Writings.

Ergo, The Apoſtle *Paul* did never ſo declare it.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny the ſequel of your *Major*; for the Words were ſpoken to the Church at *Epheſus*; and what do you talk of *Paul*'s Epiſtles, he wrote but one that I know of to the Church at *Epheſus*.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Part of the words in my Argument were ſpoken to the Elders of the Church of *Epheſus*; but I have neither *Epheſus*, nor Church of *Epheſus*, nor *Paul*'s Epiſtles in my Argument. Why do you not anſwer to the Argument.

Mr. *Leigh*. We have not the whole of the Apoſtle *Paul*'s Writings in the New Teſtament; and this that he wrote to the Church of *Epheſus*, is but a ſmall part thereof.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Pray ſpeak to the Argument: You ſee I have no ſuch Expreſſions in it as are taken up by you.

Mr. *Leigh*. I will do it by a Simile.

You know that *Paul* wrote divers Epiſtles, and in them of different Subjects.

It is as if a Man ſhould write a Book of ſeveral things, and when he hath finiſhed it, one comes and cuts off ſix Leaves thereof; and after this, there is a Queſtion ariſes, whether ſuch a Man hath writ any thing about ſuch a particular Subject. Now it doth not follow, that becauſe it is not contain'd in the reſt of his Book, that therefore it is not in the ſix Leaves that were cut off.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* If Mr. *Leigh* ſpeaks *ad Rem*, as I ſuppoſe he thinks he doth, then I thus infer upon him. Firſt, That he doth by this allow, that there is no mention made of Infant-Baptiſm in any of thoſe Writings of the Apoſtle *Paul*'s, that we have bound up with the reſt of the Holy Scriptures. Secondly, He ſuppoſes there may be ſomething ſaid of it in thoſe ſix Leaves that were cut off after he had finiſhed his Epiſtles.

Now the Aſſembly of Divines tell us, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament are the only Rule to direct us in matters of Worſhip. But whether Mr. *Leigh* be of their Mind I cannot tell.

Mr. *Leigh.* Yes, I am.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Then what you mean by it I know not, but I believe they meant what we have in the Bible, and not what is contained in thoſe ſix Leaves that were cut off, or elſe they deſigned to put a Cheat upon the whole World, which I do not ſuppoſe.

But as touching thoſe ſix Leaves, I conclude our Brethren have them not in their Cuſtody, becauſe I never heard them ſpeak any thing in the leaſt concerning it.

For my own part, I can ſpeak for my ſelf; I never ſaw them, nor heard of them till now; neither do I know any thing of the matter. But if Mr. *Leigh* or his Brethren have them in their Cuſtody, I deſire they would produce them. And when they have ſo done, if they will pleaſe to favour us ſo far as firſt to prove that thoſe were the very ſix Leaves that were written by *Paul*, we will take the pains to examine them: And if it then appears that there is any ſuch thing contained in them as Mr. *Leigh* ſpeaks of, we will allow it.

Mr. Leigh *was angry hereupon, ſaying,* What do you talk of our being the Keepers of them? And what do you talk of all the New Teſtament? Is all the New Teſtament the Apoſtle *Paul*'s writings?

Dr. *Ruſſel.* I ſay I do not confine you to *Paul*'s Epiſtles, much leſs pretend all the New Teſtament to be of the Apoſtle *Paul*'s Writing, as you would inſinuate to the People; but my Words are, It's no where ſo declared in the Writings of the New Teſtament. And do you produce one Inſtance that it is, if you can, for that will put an Iſſue to our Controverſie.

Mr. *Leigh.* You would refer what *Paul* ſaith to the Church of *Epheſus*, to the whole New Teſtament.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* I hope you will own the Holy Scriptures to be the only Rule to direct us in matters of Worſhip.

Here Mr. Leigh *breaks in upon the Doctor, not permitting him to ſpeak what he had to ſay; but inſtead thereof, he ſaith,* I will not own that we have all the Sermons that *Paul* Preached to the Church at *Epheſus*, and if we had, he might Preach it to ſome others though he did not to them, for this was ſpoken to them.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* I refer you to the Scripture. You ſay that *Paul* might declare ſome ſuch thing, and yet it may not be Recorded in the Scripture. The Words are plain, *I have not ſhunned to declare to you all the Counſel of God.*. Acts 20. 27. And in Ver. 20. *I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you.* And I do not ſuppoſe that *Paul* taught one Doctrine in one Church and another Doctrine in another. For in 1 *Cor.* 4. 17. He tells that Church, *Timothy ſhall bring you into remembrance of my ways in Chriſt, as I teach every where in every Church.*

Beſides, he doth not only tell them that he had ſo diſcharg'd his Office among them, as to be free from the Guilt of their Blood, but that he was alſo free from the Blood of all Men, Ver. 21. Teſtifying to the *Jews* and alſo to the *Greeks*, Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

And I further add, That if *Paul* never taught Infant-Baptiſm in the Church of *Epheſus*, nor in the Church of *Corinth*, nor in any other Place, I hope you will then acknowledge it to be no Goſpel Inſtitution, nor any part of the Counſel of God, nor yet profitable for the Church of God: And there is no Record in Holy Scripture of his ſo doing.

Mr. *Leigh.* I ſay *Paul's* Writings are not the hundredth Part of what *Paul* Preached. We cannot ſuppoſe that in thoſe ſix Chapters to the *Epheſians*, he could contrive to put down the whole of his Preaching to them.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Sir, you might have ſpared all this Labour; for I am ſatisfied the People will not trouble themſelves to ſeek for it any where elſe, but only in the Writings of the New Teſtament; and if they will take my Word, I can aſſure them 'tis not there to be found. And I perceive you think ſo too, or elſe you need not refer them to *Paul's* Sermons which are not written. *I have heard, indeed, of ſome unwritten Traditions, that are lock'd up in the Pope's Breaſt, to be delivered out as he finds Occaſion for the ſerving of a Turn; but I never knew that the Presbyterians were ever intruſted with any ſuch Treaſure.*

Mr. *Leigh.* You ſay it is not to be found in the Writings of

Dr. *Ruſſel.*

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Then you deny my *Minor*, which is the thing you ſhould have done before, only you were afraid of being brought to give an Inſtance. Now by denying my *minor*, you ſay it's ſomewhere ſo recorded in the Writings of the *New Teſtament*, that *Paul* did declare the Baptiſm of Infants to be a Goſpel-Inſtitution, *&c.* And to prove it is not, I argue thus;

If it be ſo recorded in the Writings of the New Teſtament, then Mr. *Leigh*, or ſome body elſe is able to ſhew it.

But neither Mr. *Leigh*, nor any body elſe, is able to ſhew it.

Ergo. It is not ſo recorded in the Writings of the New Teſtament.

Sir, I have now brought it to an univerſal Negative, as I did with Mr. *Chandler* upon the former Argument: and now it reſts upon you to produce your Inſtance.

Mr. *Leigh.* I will ſay it is in the Commiſſion, All Nations.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Are you of Mr. *Chandler's* Opinion?

Mr. *Leigh.* I will not anſwer you.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Then I ſay it is not written in the Commiſſion, that *Paul* did ever declare any thing concerning the Baptiſm of Infants.

But what do you bring this for now? you might have done it upon the firſt Argument, when we were upon the Commiſſion; but it's wholly improper now; for this that we are now upon, is, Whether the Apoſtle *Paul* hath any where ſo declared it.

Reader, Obſerve theſe Mens trifling. Do they not know as well as we, that the Commiſſion of our Lord for Holy Baptiſm was given long before *Paul's* Converſion; and yet they have the Confidence to affirm before ſo great an Auditory, That it is written in the Commiſſion, that *Paul* did declare the Baptiſm of Infants to be a Goſpel-Inſtitution, *&c.* which is the thing expreſſed in my Argument.

Upon this, the Reverend Mr. *Chandler*, (who had quitted the Work before) began now in a great Fury to break ſilence again, ſaying, You are a perfect Sophiſter, your Arguments are full of Fallacy.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* It is an eaſie matter for a Man to ſay ſo, that underſtands not an Argument himſelf.

Mr. *Leigh.* Then, pray Sir, begin again from *Acts* 20. 27.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Truly, Mr. *Leigh*, I did not come ſo many miles to ſpend my time thus, to go backwards and forwards after this manner.

Mr. *Chandler.* You muſt do ſo, if you underſtand the Rules of Tergiverſation.

[*This was one of Mr.* Chandler's *Witticiſms.*]

Dr. *Ruſſel.* If I do not underſtand thoſe Rules when I have occaſion for them, I will come to you and learn.

But to return to Mr. *Leigh*, for I have not done with him yet: *Sir*, you have aſſigned the Commiſſion to prove that *Paul* did declare *Infant-Baptiſm* to be a Goſpel-Inſtitution, part of the Counſel of God, *&c.* Now it's impoſſible that ſhould be written in the Commiſſion, as I have told you before: You muſt therefore ſhew us where it is ſo recorded in ſome other part of the *New Teſtament*; and not aſſign a place where there can be no mention of it.

Mr. *Leigh.* He ſays he gives us the Latitude of the whole *New Teſtament*, but will not admit of the Commiſſion, becauſe that doth not ſay that *Paul* hath ſo declared.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* And there is very good reaſon for it; for the Apoſtle *Paul* is now under conſideration, as mention'd in my Argument; who ſolemnly proteſteth that in the diſcharge of his Miniſtry, he had freed himſelf from the blood of all Men, in delivering to them all that his Maſter had given him in Commiſſion. That he had not ſhunned to declare all the Counſel of God, he had kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God; but as a faithful Steward of the Myſteries of God, he did diſpenſe the Word, as himſelf declares in 1 *Cor.* 4. 1, 2. And I verily believe, that *Paul* was as faithful, as eminent, and as laborious a Servant as ever Chriſt had upon Earth. And therefore the force of my Argument depends upon this, That if *Paul* never ſaid one Word about Infant-Baptiſm, then it can be no part of the Counſel of God, nor a Goſpel-Inſtitution, nor ever given him in Commiſſion by his Lord and Maſter.

You have denied my *Minor*; I have proved it by bringing you to an Inſtance by an Univerſal Negative. You have aſſigned the Commiſſion; I have ſhewed you the Impoſſibility of proving it from thence. I have preſſed you to aſſign ſome other part of the *New Teſtament* for an Inſtance: I have not as yet been able to obtain it. Here are divers Men of Parts and Learning among you, can none of you produce ſo much as one Inſtance to prove it? Surely the People muſt needs conclude you have none to give. I therefore challenge you to produce the place where it is written, that *Paul* ever ſaid one Word of Infant-Baptiſm. And till that be done, my Argument will ſtand good.

Mr. *Leigh.* If *Paul* did not declare it, if we have other places apparent and plain, at leaſt conſequential, it is ſufficient.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* This is not an Anſwer to my Argument, you might have gone here upon the other, but cannot upon this; [illegible] aſſign ſome of thoſe places then. Mr.

Mr. *Chandler*. We deny the Consequence, *Paul* might speak of it somewhere else, tho' it is not found in his *Epistles*.

Mr. *Robinson*. You are to prove that, because *Paul* did not shun to declare to the Church of *Ephesus* the whole Counsel of God, therefore Baptizing of Infants must be found there, or else it is no part of the Counsel of God.

Mr. *Leigh*. However, we will suppose the thing (but not grant it) that *Paul* has not spoken of Infant-Baptism.

Mr. *Williams*. If you suppose it, we will take it for granted; if we may not, say so.

Thus ended their Opposition to this Argument.

Dr. *Russel*. I will now proceed to another Argument.

Arg. 4 Christ's Commission doth shew who are to be Baptized:

But it doth not shew that Infants are to be Baptized:

Ergo, Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny the *Minor*.

Dr. *Russel*. By so doing, you suppose it doth shew it.

I therefore thus argue.

If the Commission doth shew that Infants are to be Baptized, Mr. *Leigh*, or some other Person can shew it us in the Commission.

But neither Mr. *Leigh*, nor any other Person, is able to shew it us in the Commission.

Ergo, The Commission doth not shew that Infants are to be Baptized.

Mr. *Leigh*. It is included in the Word, All Nations.

Dr. *Russel*. I beg your Favour; Mr. *Chandler* asserted in his Sermon, That it was the Infants of believing Parents that were to be baptized: And that it was necessary Men should repent and believe, otherwise they had no Right to this Ordinance. And if we were sent (saith he) into an Heathen Nation, we ought to engage Men to repent and believe, before we Administer this Ordinance to them. Here are Qualifications required in the Persons to be baptized (by your own Confession) without which you must not administer it. And it is contrary both to your own Principles and Practice, to baptize Jews, Turks and Heathens, and all their Infants, without previous Qualifications to fit them for it.

Mr. *Leigh*. I say it is included in the Word, All Nations: Do you prove it is not.

Dr. *Russel*. You have brought an Instance, and it is your business to make good your own Instance; otherwise my Argument stands firm and untouch'd.

But

But if I shew there are some Qualifications required in the Commission, and prove that those cannot be found in Infants; then Infants cannot be included in the Word, All Nations.

I tell you he hath commanded us to baptize some Persons, but he hath not commanded us to baptize any Infants; which I thus prove.

If those that Christ in his Commission hath commanded to be baptized, must first be made Disciples according to that Commission; then Infants are not to be baptized by Virtue of that Commission.

But those that Christ in his Commission hath commanded to be baptized, must first be made Disciples according to that Commission.

Ergo, Infants are not to be baptized by Virtue of that Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny your Consequence. Repeat it again.

Dr. *Russel*. Then I will make it Categorical.

All those required to be baptized by Christ's Commission, are Disciples: Infants are not capable to be Disciples, as I have already proved.

Ergo, Not required to be baptized by Christ's Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny your whole Argument: That all that Christ requires to be baptized, are Disciples, and that Infants are not capable.

Dr. *Russel*. If no other but Disciples are express'd in the Commission, then the *Major* is true.

And if Infants are uncapable to be made Disciples, then the *Minor* is true also.

Mr. *Leigh*. We say they are implied; you allowed good Consequences but now.

Dr. *Russel*. But here are Disciples mentioned in the Commission; and none but such that are made so by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. *Leigh*. You talk of the Commission: It is the good Consequences I insist upon; and say, Persons are not to be compleat Disciples before they are baptized; nor actually taught before they are Disciples.

Dr. *Russel*. Perhaps you mean a Man is not a compleat Christian, if he hath not attained to the highest Perfection he is capable of whilst in this Life; although he hath been a real Christian for many Years. I speak not of such a Completion, but of such that are actual Disciples of Christ, made so by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. *Leigh*. I say there is no necessity of being Disciples in your Sense, before they are baptized.

Dr.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Then I will prove there is a neceſſity.

If our Lord in his Commiſſion did not require his Apoſtles to baptize any, but only ſuch as they had before made his Diſciples by Teaching; then there is a neceſſity they ſhould be Actual Diſciples before they are baptized.

But our Lord in his Commiſſion did not require his Apoſtles to baptize any, but only ſuch as they had before made his Diſciples by Teaching.

Ergo, There is a neceſſity they ſhould be Actual Diſciples before they are baptized.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny the *Minor.*

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Then I will read the Commiſſion.

Mr. *Leigh.* You need not do that, we all know the Commiſſion very well.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* I will read my Maſter's Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore, and diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

This Commiſſion is very ſolemnly delivered, wherein our Lord declares, that all Power in Heaven and Earth was given to him. And by Virtue of that Power —Here Mr. *Robinſon* ſtops the *Doctor*, and cries out, You are not to preach here, Sir.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* May I not have leave to draw my Inference from the Text?

Mr. *Leigh.* Form your Argument. The Text doth not diſcover it.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Is not our Lord's Commiſſion of as good Authority as my Argument? When I have ſpoken to that, I will then form an Argument from it, if you will be ſilent, and ſuffer me ſo to do.

I ſay, that in this great Commiſſion, our Lord declares his great Power.

Mr. *Leigh.* Form your Argument.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* I hope the uſe of all our Syllogiſms is to bring us to the Commiſſion: And now we are come to it, let us ſee whether theſe things are to be found therein, or not. Will you pretend that Infants are in the Commiſſion, and muſt not the People be ſuffered to ſee whether there be any thing mention'd about them, or not?

Mr. *Robinſon.* Is this your Argument? Bring your Argument. And then he bawls very loud, ſaying, Mr. *Williams*, will you ſuffer him to Preach?

Mr. *Williams* anſwers, No, I will not ſuffer him to Preach here.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* What do you talk of Preaching? Are ye afraid of the Commiſſion? I hope it is not ſo bad with you as it was

with

with ſome in Times paſt, whom one of the Fathers (*i. e. Tertullian*) calls by the name of *Lucifugæ Scripturarum, &c.* Flyers from the Light of the Scripture (as Bats do from the light of the Sun:) What is the reaſon, Gentlemen, you will not endure to hear the Commiſſion opened? Will you fly from the Light of the Commiſſion of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt? Is it not the Subject contained in the Queſtion; and will you (or dare you) deny that what I have ſaid is in the Commiſſion?

Mr. *Leigh.* We ſay not ſo.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* If you ſhould, you would directly oppoſe Mr. *Calvin.* For he ſaith, *There is no mention made of Infants in the Commiſſion,* as it is expreſſed either in *Matth.* 28. or *Mark* 16. And further ſaith, we may as well apply thoſe words in 2 *Theſſ.* 3.10. *That if any would not work, neither ſhould he eat,* to little Infants, and ſo keep them from Food till they ſtarve, as to apply what is ſaid in the Commiſſion to them, whereas it belongs only to the Adult.

Mr. *Robinſon.* This is not to the purpoſe, what have we to do with what Mr. *Calvin* ſays?

Dr. *Ruſſel.* I did not know but you might have had a Veneration for Mr. *Calvin*; but ſeeing it's otherwiſe, I will thus Argue from the Commiſſion.

If there be an expreſs Command in our Lord's Commiſſion for the baptizing of ſome Perſons, and there be no expreſs Command neither there nor elſewhere, for the baptizing of Infants; then the Baptiſm of Infants is not contained in that Commiſſion:

Mr. *Robinſon.* We ſay though——

Dr. *Ruſſel.* What again, Mr. *Robinſon*? muſt I always be thus broke in upon by you? What is the meaning of it? When you ſee you are like to be pinched upon an Argument, then you make it your buſineſs to hinder me from ſpeaking: Doth this become a Moderator?

I beg I may have Liberty to ſpeak out, and not be thus taken up in the midſt of an Argument. Pray, Sir, remember what the Wiſe-man ſaith of ſuch a one, that anſwers a matter before he hears it.

I ſay, if there be an expreſs Command in our Lord's Commiſſion for the baptizing of ſome Perſons, and there be no expreſs Command neither there nor elſewhere for the baptizing of Infants; then the Baptiſm of Infants is not contained in that Commiſſion:

But there is an expreſs Command in our Lord's Commiſſion for the baptizing of ſome Perſons; and there is no expreſs Command either there or elſewhere for the baptizing of Infants:

Ergo,

Ergo, The Baptism of Infants is not contained in that Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. Instead of giving his Answer to the Argument, he shams it off after this manner: saying, I appeal to the People. Tho' he allowed Consequences but now, yet now he requires an express Scripture. And yet I say, If Nations include Infants, they are expressly mentioned.

Upon this, Mr. Robinson *turns Dictator, and says to Mr.* Leigh, You were better deny his Consequence.

Dr. *Russel* saith, Pray, Mr. *Leigh*, be pleased to change places with Mr. *Robinson*, let him be Disputant, and you Moderator; for I perceive neither you nor I am able to please him. *This was refused. Upon which, Dr.* Russel *said to Mr.* Robinson, Pray, *Sir*, do not you thus dictate to him, I have none to dictate to me: Pray let him answer my Argument.

Here Mr. Leigh *did as Mr.* Robinson *had taught him, and denied the Consequence; and also that an express Command was necessary to authorize the baptizing of Infants.*

Dr. *Russel*. My Argument was, If there be an express Command for the baptizing of some persons, you deny the Sequel of the *Major*; and in so doing you say, That notwithstanding there is no express Command for the baptizing of Infants, neither there nor elsewhere in all the Holy Scripture; yet nevertheless they are intended in the Commission,

Mr. *Leigh*. I do so.

Dr. *Russel*. And I say, if there be an express Command for the baptizing of some Persons, but none at all for the baptizing of Infants; then they are not at all intended in that Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny first the Sequel of the *Major*, and then I will deny your *Minor*.

Dr. *Russel*. This seems very strange, that when I have made it appear so evidently from the Commission it self, that there is an express Command for the baptizing of some Persons: and yet it should not be allowed as a necessary Consequence from the Premises, that Infants are not intended; when your selves have confessed there is no express Command in all the Scriptures, for the baptizing of Infants.

Mr. Leigh. I deny the Sequel.

Dr. *Russel*. Then I will prove that there is an express *Command* for the baptizing of some Persons, from the *Commission* it self.

Mr. *Leigh*. That is not the sequel of the *Major*, it is that I deny.

Dr. *Russel*. And I bring the *Commission* to prove it. But you say, that notwithstanding our Lord hath expressly commanded

ſome Perſons to be baptized; altho' he hath not commanded Infants to be baptized, yet they may be ſome of that number. Hath Chriſt two ſorts of Subjects that he commands to be baptized in that Commiſſion? Or rather, are ſome commanded, and others not commanded, and yet both to be baptized; the one by a Command, and the other without?

Here Mr. Leigh *refuſes to anſwer, and cries out,* Put it into a Syllogiſm.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* If no Perſons are to be baptized according to that *Commiſſion*, but what are there expreſly commanded; and Infants are not ſo commanded; then the Conſequence of the *Major* is true:

But no Perſons are to be baptized according to that Commiſſion, but what are there expreſly commanded; and Infants are not ſo commanded:

Ergo, The Conſequence of the *Major* is true.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny your *Minor.*

Dr. *Ruſſel.* By ſo doing you ſay there are ſome to be baptized that are not there expreſly commanded.

Mr. *Leigh.* Do you not know your own Argument?

Dr. *Ruſſel.* I repeat it not for my own Knowledge, but for the Peoples Information. And I prove my *Minor* thus:

If the Words of the Commiſsion are an expreſs Command to the Apoſtles, to direct them whom they ſhould baptize, then the *Minor* is true:

But the Words of the Commiſsion are an expreſs Command to the Apoſtles, to direct them who they ſhould baptize:

Ergo, The *Minor* is true.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny your *Minor.*

Dr. *Ruſſel.* If there be no other Commiſsion of our Lord for Holy Baptiſm, but what is recorded in *Matth.* 28. and *Mark* 16. then the *Minor* is true:

But there is no other: *Ergo*, the *Minor* is true.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny the ſequel of your *Major.*

Dr. *Ruſſel.* But we are now upon the Commiſsion.

Mr. *Leigh.* We are ſo: But we ſay, good Conſequences derived from the Commiſſion, are ſufficient.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* So you may if you pleaſe; but I had rather walk exactly according to the Commiſsion of our Lord, than by ſuch Conſequences wherein I may be deceived.

Mr. *Robinſon.* I matter not what you had rather do, or what your Opinon is, I am for Conſequences.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny the ſequel of the *Major*; That they are to baptize none, but ſuch as they are expreſly commanded.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Then I thus argue:

If

If there be no manner of Allowance given them to baptize any other but what they are expreſly commanded, then the Sequel of the *Major* is true :

But there is no manner of Allowance given them to baptize any other but what they are expreſly commanded :

Ergo, the Sequel of the *Major* is true.

Mr. *Leigh* was pleaſed here to give a general Denial, without diſtinguiſhing : Upon which Dr. *Ruſſel* referr'd him to his former Argument, wherein he had already ſhewed, that there is an expreſs Command for the baptizing of all ſuch, that they are required to baptize by Virtue of Chriſt's Commiſſion.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny your *minor*, but diſtinguiſh between the Command being expreſſed and the Subjects intended.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. If the Words in the Commiſſion about Holy Baptiſm be a Command from Chriſt to his Apoſtles, then the *Minor* is true :

But the Words in the Commiſſion about Holy Baptiſm are a Command from Chriſt to his Apoſtles.

Ergo, The *Minor* is true.

Mr. *Leigh*. Upon Diſtinction, we deny that all the Subjects are expreſs'd.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. My Argument ſaith, They have not Allowance to baptize any other. I am now therefore to prove that the Commiſſion is a Command to them, if you deny it.

Mr. *Leigh*. I allow that the Command is expreſs'd : But I ſay the Subjects are to be brought in by Conſequence.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. Then I will prove that the Subjects are expreſs'd.

If Chriſt did command his Apoſtles to baptize ſuch as believe and are made Diſciples, then the Subjects are expreſs'd :

But Chriſt did command his Apoſtles to baptize ſuch as believe and are made Diſciples :

Ergo, The Subjects are expreſs'd.

Mr. *Leigh*. I find a fault with your Syllogiſm ; your *Major* ſhould be Univerſal.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. I was to prove there is a Command, with Reſpect to the Subjects ; and therefore I have form'd the Syllogiſm right. For it is evident that Believers and Diſciples are the Subjects they are commanded to baptize.

Mr. *Robinſon*. You muſt ſay *all* the Subjects.

Dr. *Ruſſel*. By your Favour, there is no need of that : For Mr. *Leigh* denies there is an expreſs Command in Chriſt's Commiſſion for any Subjects.

Mr. *Leigh*. I hope the People can teſtifie that I ſaid the Command is expreſs'd : But the Subjects to be brought in conſequentially.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Is not that the ſame which I ſay you ſaid? I know you allowed there was a Command for the thing it ſelf, but not for the Subjects. And therefore I have anſwered rightly, and your Oppoſition is unreaſonable.

Mr. *Leigh.* We muſt all confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt gave Commiſſion to baptize Believers when at the age of Maturity. Such as were before *Jews* and *Greeks*, and newly believing in the Lord Jeſus, were thereupon to be baptized; but afterwards the Children of thoſe Believers.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* It's ſaid in *Mark 16. 16. He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.* Here is not one Word of Infants.

Mr. *Leigh.* And it follows, *He that believeth not, ſhall be damn'd.* Now if Believing be previous to Baptiſm, by the ſame Way of Arguing it muſt be neceſſary to Salvation; and ſo you muſt ſay, That all not believing are damn'd, and ſo all Infants are damn'd.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* This is a *Non-ſequitur*: For Infants are not at all intended in this Commiſſion, as I have already ſhewed you, and as Mr. *John Calvin* doth alſo affirm.

But I hope Mr. *Leigh* will allow our Saviour's Words to be True: That all thoſe his Apoſtles preached to, according to his Commiſſion, if they did not believe, they ſhould be damned. For of ſuch it is ſaid, *He that believeth not, is condemned already, becauſe he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.*

But as touching Infants, I am far from believing that God hath decreed them (as ſuch) to eternal Damnation. I will rather believe that all Infants dying in their Infancy are elected, than conclude that any of them are damned. And I ſuppoſe you do not know the contrary. If you do, I deſire you would tell the People ſo.

Mr. *Leigh.* What do you put that upon us for?

Dr. *Ruſſel.* Becauſe I think it's reaſonable you ſhould tell the People what your Opinion is, ſeeing you have ſtarted it; for you ſee I have given my Opinion freely about it; and if you think otherwiſe, pray tell the People ſo.

For then I conceive that your baptizing their Infants will do them no good; for you cannot alter the Decrees of Heaven: Or if you believe, as the Papiſts do, that Grace is conveyed to them barely by the Act done, notwithſtanding the Children are wholly paſſive in it, pray tell us ſo.

Mr. *Leigh* refuſed to anſwer to the Former, but gave this Anſwer to the Latter: No, we deny that.

Here Mr. *John Williams*, baptiz'd Miniſter, offered his Arguments.

If

If Believers are the only Subjects of baptism according to Christ's Commission, then Infants are not.

But Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission:

Therefore Infants are not.

Mr. *Leigh* denied the sequel of the *major*; which was thus proved.

If Infants are incapable of believing, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission:

But Infants are incapable of believing.

Therefore they are not the Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission.

Mr. *Leigh* said the *Greek* Word signified to make Disciples; and I deny that Infants are incapable of being made Disciples.

Mr. *Williams* said he did not understand Greek; he must leave that to his Brother.

Then Mr. *Leigh* said, I deny the *minor*.

Mr. *Williams* proved his *minor* thus:

If the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will, then Infants are incapable of believing:

But the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will:

Therefore Infants are incapable of believing.

Mr. *Leigh* denied the sequel of the *major*, which Mr. *Williams* thus proved.

If none can believe on Jesus Christ, that never heard of Jesus Christ, then Infants are incapable of believing:

But none can believe on Jesus Christ that never heard of Jesus Christ:

Therefore Infants are incapable of believing.

Mr. *Leigh* denied the sequel of the *major*.

But he should have remembred what is written, *Rom.* 10. 14. *How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a Preacher?* And I do not suppose our Antagonists think they are obliged to preach to New-born Infants. And yet the Administration of Baptism is (by the Commission) restrained to such as are made believers by the Preaching of the Word.

These Arguments being sufficient to prove the Incapacity of Infants believing, the next Argument Mr. *Williams* offer'd, was from thence, to prove that Infants could not be the Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission.

If the Administrator must have an Account of the Faith of the Subject before he baptize him, then Infants are not the Subjects of baptism according to Christ's Commission:

But

But the Administrator must have an Account of the Faith of the Subject before he baptize him:

Therefore Infants are not the Subjects of baptism according to Christ's Commission.

Mr. *Leigh* denied the *minor*.

For the Proof of which, Mr. *Williams* urged two Scriptures, *Acts* 8. 36, 37. and *Matth.* 28. 19. and said, when the Eunuch proposed for baptism, *Philip* tells him, *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst.* The contrary (that fairly offers it self) is this; That if thou dost not believe with all thine Heart, thou mayst not. And upon this, the Eunuch declared his Faith before he was baptized.

From whence it's evident, the Eunuch was content to be taught; *Philip* teaches him; and yet after this, he must know whether he believes, before he baptized him. Therefore it follows, they must have actual Learning; and the Minister must also know that they have it before he baptize them.

And in *Matth.* 28. 19. *Go disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them.* From whence I thus argue.

If Ministers have no commission to baptize any but such as are discipled to *Christ*, then they must have an Account of their Discipleship before they baptize them.

But Ministers have no Commission to baptize any but such are discipled to *Christ*.

Therefore they must have an Account of their Discipleship before they baptize them.

To which was added, that *Erasmus* in his Paraphrase upon the New Testament, reads the Commission thus, *Go and teach all Nations, and when they have learned, dip them.* And I further say, If the Administrator must have an Account of the Person's learning before he be baptized, then a bare going to School is not sufficient to constitute him a Disciple.

Mr. *Robinson.* Do you see, Sirs! this Gentleman grounds his Opinion upon the Authority of *Erasmus*.

Dr. *Russel.* Why must *Erasmus* be thus slighted? Here are some Honourable Persons know very well, that *Erasmus* was a man not to be despised for his Skill about the Etymology of a Greek Word. But any thing serves your turn at a pinch.

Mr. *Leigh.* He quotes *Erasmus*; and it's well known he was between Papist and Protestant. Now many of these Men, speaking against Infant-baptism, will call it Popery; and yet he quotes *Erasmus* for their Judgment.

Now, forasmuch as Mr. *Leigh* slipp'd the Argument, and only replied to that of *Erasmus*, that he was *Inter-Papist*, &c. Mr. *Williams* gave him this Answer.

Sir

Sir, You have heard my Argument, to which you have given no Answer. As touching *Erasmus*, I did not quote him as building my Faith on his Authority, but for his Judgment; it being the Translation of a Man that understood the *Original*: And altho' he was not accounted one of the best of Men, yet he was accounted one of the best of Scholars in his Time.

Mr. *Leigh*. And now as to the Eunuch, he was a Proselyte too, and his Infants, if he had any, were to be taken in also. *Philip* comes to him, and he requires a Confession of his Faith, because he was a grown Man. Yet had he had an Infant with him, he had had a Right to this Ordinance after he believed. When by your Opinion it must be cast out, because not capable of actual Believing.

Now I deny that he that administers the Ordinance, must always have an account of the Person, whether he hath Learned or not.

(I suppose Mr. *Leigh* forgot himself, to talk of an Eunuch's having Children. It puts me in mind of a Story I lately heard, of a *Presbyterian* Minister that undertook (in a Sermon) to prove Infant-Baptism, and to that end chose this Text for his purpose, of *Philip's baptizing the Eunuch*. And when he had insisted some time upon it, he speaks after this manner to the People: *Beloved, when you are gone, perhaps you will say, What is all this to the purpose? Here is not one Word of Infants in the Text. It is true*, says he, *there is not, but I will tell you how that comes in: Had he had his Wife and Children with him, they had then been baptized as well as himself: But they were at a great distance from him; but as soon as he came home, immediately he baptized them all.* I will make no Comment upon it, but only this: If these Gentlemen know what an Eunuch is, then it's vain Babling; if they do not, let them go to the Grand Signior's *Seraglio*, and learn.)

Mr. *Williams*. We have plain direction for what I have said; *Philip* said to the Eunuch, *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest*. And accordingly he took an account of his Faith.

And in the Commission, *Go disciple all Nations, baptizing them*. From whence it's evident, it was those they had made Disciples, that they were to baptize. And therefore they must know whether they are Disciples or no, before they must adventure to baptize them.

Mr. *Leigh*. You argue thus, because αὐτοὺς *Them*, is of the Masculine Gender, it must agree with μαθητὰς *Disciples*, being of the same Gender, and not with πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *all Nations*. But any School-boy that hath but learned his Greek Grammar, can resolve this.

Now

Now Mr. Williams *had told him before, that he did not understand* Greek ; *and so he made bold to vapour with it, when he was responding to him.*

But Mr. Leigh *might have been so civil to have told the old Gentleman his Sense of it, and not (in such a light manner) to have referr'd him to a School-boy for his Information.*

A School-boy knows (if Mr. *Leigh* doth not) that the Rule in the Greek Grammar is as follows :

Relativum cum Antecedente concordat Genere, Numero, & Persona : And therefore must give it for Mr. *Williams.*

But I will refer the Reader to a better Authority than a School-boy : The late Reverend and Learned Minister of the Gospel, Mr. *John Gosnold,* in his Book Entituled, *Βαπτισμῶν Διδαχὴ, pag.* 24. who thus saith, *The Word* Them *(Baptizing them) hath no reference unto all Nations, as is to be seen in the Grammar of the* Text, *αὐτὸς,* Them, *being of the Masculine Gender, but πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,* all Nations, *of the Neuter.*

This *Them* then must have reference to Disciples, to such as are first taught :

But Mr. *Williams* passes by this trivial Flourish, and proceeds to a new Argument.

If Infants are incapable of denying themselves for Christ : then they are incapable of being made Disciples of Christ.

But Infants are incapable of denying themselves for Christ; therefore they are incapable of being made Disciples of Christ.

Mr. Leigh denies the Sequel of the Major.

Mr. Williams *proves it thus.*

If a Person cannot be his Disciple unless he deny both Relative Self and Personal Self, then the Sequel is true :

But Infants are not capable so to do :

Therefore the Sequel is true.

Mr. *Leigh,* This purely refers to grown Persons ; and by the same Argument you may say Infants must not eat ; because it is said in another place, *He that cannot work, must not eat.*

Mr. *Williams,* Nay, Sir, It is he that *will not work,* not he that cannot. It is he that is able and will not. For I hope you will provide for your Parents, when by reason of Age they are not able to work for themselves.

Mr. *Leigh.* But this purely refers to grown Persons, and I deny that Believers only are Disciples.

Mr. *Williams.* I proved that thus : Those that in *Matth.* 28. are called Disciples, are in *Mark* 16. called Believers : So that they are the same Persons intended.

Hereupon Mr. Leigh *not being able to give a direct Answer, endeavours to shift off the force of those two Texts, and his Inference from them, by this Evasion.*

Mr.

Mr. Leigh. I would know whether Infants are not as capable of believing in Christ, as of comming to Christ? Now they are said to come when their Parents brought them. For Christ says, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*: And it's most probable they were brought in the Arms to Christ. Why may they not be said to believe, when they do not actually believe; if imputatively they are said to come when their Parents brought them?

So, why may not they be said to believe imputatively, when their Parents devote them to Jesus Christ, although the Children do not actually believe, but only the Parents?

Mr. *Williams.* I deny the parents Faith was ever imputed to the Child. Prove it if you can.

Mr. *Leigh.* We talk of believers *in foro Ecclesiæ*, and *in foro Dei* with Distinction; and under this Notion, and no other do we account believers are so.

And under this Notion, I mean *in foro Ecclesiæ*, the Parents Faith may be imputed to their Children.

Mr. *Williams.* We say a Person is not a Disciple of Christ, till he hath learned *Christ*. We do not allow of any such Imputation: And Mr. *Leigh* hath not offer'd any thing to prove it.

Dr. Russel. It is time to come to some Instance; therefore to force you upon it, I argue thus:

If the Apostles of our Lord did never baptize any Infant, then the baptism of Infants is not according to *Christ*'s Commission:

But the Apostles of our Lord did never baptize any Infant:

Ergo, The baptism of Infants is not according to *Christ*'s Commission.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny your *minor*.

Dr. Russel. I prove my *minor* thus.

If there be any account that the Apostles did ever baptize any Infant, it is some were Recorded in the Writings of the *New Testament*.

But it is no where so recorded in those Writings:

Ergo, There is not any account that the Apostles did ever baptize any Infant.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny your *minor*.

Dr. Russel. I must now force you upon an Instance by an Universal Negative.

If there be any such account in those Writings, Mr. *Leigh*, or some other Person is able to shew it us:

But neither Mr. *Leigh* nor any other Person is able to do it:

Ergo, There is no such account there to be found.

Here Mr. Leigh, *being wholly deſtitute of an Inſtance ; to ſhift it off, he denies the Sequel of the* major. *And ſaith*, it doth not follow it muſt of neceſſity be written in the *New Teſtament*.

Now although this was contrary to the Rules of Diſpute, yet Dr. Ruſſel *could not urge him to give any inſtance ; wherefore he Argues upon him thus.*

Dr. Ruſſel. If nothing elſe will do with you, I will prove the ſequel of my *major*, according to your denial.

If there be no other Rule left to direct us how we are to Worſhip God in this Ordinance of Baptiſm according to the Goſpel, but what is contained in the Writings of the *New Teſtament* ; then it muſt of neceſſity follow, that it be therein written, if ſuch an account be any where to be found :

But there is no other Rule left to direct us how we are to Worſhip God in this Ordinance of Baptiſm according to the Goſpel, but what is contained in the Writings of the *New Teſtament*.

Ergo, It muſt of neceſſity follow, that it be therein written, if ſuch an account be any where to be found.

Mr. *Leigh.* I ſay it might be practiſed in thoſe Times, though not Recorded in the *New Teſtament*.

Dr. Ruſſel. Will you grant that it is not Recorded in the *New Teſtament*.

Mr. *Leigh.* We will ſuppoſe it ; but not grant it.

Dr. *Ruſſel.* The reaſon why you ſuppoſe it is becauſe you cannot prove it : For you are not ſo free of your conceſſions.

Mr. *Leigh.* It is not Recorded in the *New Teſtament* what you practiſe, that grown Children of Believers were Baptized. I challenge you to give one Inſtance of any one born of believing Parents, baptized at Age.

Dr. Ruſſel. I have called for one Inſtance from Scripture ſeveral times, of any one Infant that was ever baptized, and you have not been able to produce it. This you now ſpeak of, is beſides the matter we are upon : And is uſed on purpoſe to divert us from our Argument, and lead us to ſomething elſe that is foreign to it. Pray do you firſt ſhew us were it is ſo written in the *New Teſtament*, that any one Infant was baptized, if you can : and then you ſhall hear what we have to ſay.

Mr. *Leigh.* Theſe Men talk much of Scripture, and call upon us to produce Scripture for our baptizing of Infants ; as if they had abundance of proof for their Practice : Now let them give but one Inſtance of what is their Practice : namely, of one Perſon that was born of a Believer, and was baptized when he came to grown Years, and I will give them the Cauſe.

Dr. Ruſſel.

Dr. Ruſſel. I will inſtance in *Conſtantine the Great*, whoſe Mother *Helena* was a Chriſtian, and yet he was not baptized till he was conſiderably in Years.

Beſides I do not remember, that there is any account in Hiſtory, during the firſt 300 Years, that any one of the Fathers, or eminent Biſhops of the Church, that were born of Chriſtian Parents, were baptized until they were about Twenty or Thirty Years of Age. And if any of you know the contrary, I deſire you would ſhew it.

Mr Leigh. What do you tell us of the Fathers? We are not bound to abide by their Teſtimony.

Dr. Ruſſel. This is the firſt time I have ever met with this Anſwer from you Pædobaptiſts, to tell us you diſown the Teſtimony of the Fathers in the point of Infant Baptiſm. When you think the Fathers are on your ſide, then we can hear enough of them; but now you ſee they are againſt you, you will not abide by their Teſtimony. You know I do not alledge it to prove the Inſtitution, but only Matter of Fact. But ſeeing you will not abide by their Teſtimony, I ſhall leave it to be conſidered by the People; For I am well ſatisfied there are ſome Honourable Perſons here, know what I ſay to be true.

Mr. Williams *doth then proceed to a Scripture Inſtance; and asks Mr.* Leigh *this Queſtion.* Was not the Mother of our Lord a Believer, when Chriſt was born?

Mr. Leigh anſwers, What do you ask that Queſtion for? Every Body knows that.

Mr. Williams. But do you believe it?

Mr. Leigh. Yes, I do believe it: What then?

Mr. *Williams* Then here is an inſtance for you from Scripture, of the Child of a Believer, that was a Believer before he was born; and yet he was not baptized till he came to Years, And this we can prove.

Upon this the People fell a laughing at Mr. *Leigh*, and his Countenance changed pale; and he was under ſome ſeeming Conſternation of Mind, ſo that he could not preſently recover himſelf; but at laſt his Spirits rallied again, and then he ſpake to this Effect.

Mr. *Leigh.* Our Diſcourſe was grounded on the Commiſſion. Now was this before the Commiſſion, or after it?

Dr. Ruſſel. It is a miſtake, Mr. *Leigh*, we were not now upon the Commiſſion, but upon your Queſtion. And I think Mr. *Williams* hath given you a pertinent Anſwer, every way ſuitable to your Queſtion, and the Challenge you made us: and you are bound to take it. *Upon this he made no Reply; But addreſſed himſelf to us after this manner.* Now if you pleaſe I

will become Opponent. *Our Answer was*, You may, if you think fit, we are contented.

Mr. *Leigh*. Then I Argue thus.

If Infants are visible Church-Members, then they are to be baptized.

But Infants are visible Church Members.

Ergo. They are to be baptized.

Dr. Russel This Argument doth not include the Point in Question, for you ought to put in these Words, according to Christ's Commission.

Mr *Leigh* refused so to do.

Upon which Dr. Russel *asked him this Question.*

Are you of Mr. *Chandler's* mind in this Matter? *He says* That Baptism is an Initiating Ordinance.

Mr. *Leigh* answered, Yes, I am.

Dr. Russel. Then make Sense of your Argument, if you can: For it will run thus.

If Infants are already visible Members of the Church, then they are to be baptized that they may be made so.

It is as if I should say, That because such a Man is in this House already, therefore there must some Act pass upon him to bring him in, when he is actually in the House before. Make Sense of this, if you can.

However, I will deny the *Minor*; and say they are not visible Church Members before they are baptized.

Mr. Chandler. If there be no Precept or Example in all the Word of God, to warrant us to make any other Initiating Ordinance into the Church but Baptism, then visible Church-Members ought to be baptized

But there is no other Initiating Ordinance into the Church besides Baptism

Ergo Visible Church-Members ought to be baptized.

Dr. Russel What, doth not *Mr. Chandler* know the difference between the *Major* and *Minor*? I deny the *Minor*, and his Argument is to prove the Sequel of the *Major*: which I had confuted before.

But if this be true that *Mr. Chandler* says, it is a full Answer to *Mr Leigh's Minor*: For then it runs thus: if there be no other way to bring Persons into the visible Church but by Baptism; then they were not visible Church-Members before they were baptized. Which is directly opposite to what *Mr Leigh* hath affirmed.

Mr. Robinson. This Argument was brought to prove that visible Church-Members are to be admitted to Baptism.

Mr. Williams. I deny that Infants are visible Church Members in their Infancy.

Mr. Leigh. I will prove that some are so, from *Mat.* 19. 14. *Suffer the little Children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Dr. Russel. Do you bring this to prove that these Children were Baptized?

Mr. Leigh. No, I do not pretend to any such thing.

Dr. Russel. What then do you bring it for?

Mr. Leigh. I bring it to prove that Infants are visible Church-members.

Dr. Russel. If you had brought it to prove that Infants had a right to the Kingdom of Glory, I should have thought you had brought it to a better purpose, and more agreeable to the scope of the Place.

Mr. Leigh, I argue thus upon it.

Those that belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, the visible Church of Christ, are visible Church members:

But the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, the visible Church of Christ, is in part made up of little Children.

Ergo, Little Children are visible Church members.

Dr. Russel. I might here object against the form of your Argument: But to pass that by, I do deny your *minor.*

Mr. Leigh. I shall prove my *minor,* by an Induction of Particulars.

There are divers Acceptations of the Kingdom of Heaven in Scripture. As,

1. It signifies the Laws and Promises of the Kingdom.

2. The Graces of the Kingdom, whereby we are enabled to observe those Laws. And thus it is set forth by a grain of Mustard seed, by Leaven and the like.

3. It sometimes signifies Jesus Christ's Management of his Subjects on Earth.

4. And sometimes it signifies the Happiness of the Saints in Glory.

5. And many times it is taken for the visible Church Militant. And in no other Sense but this last, can it be taken in this Scripture to make good Sense of it; which I shall prove by an Argument of Induction.

If it be Nonsense to say, Of such is the Laws and Promises of the Kingdom; if it be Nonsence to say, Of such is the Graces of the Kingdom: If it be Nonsence to say, Of such is Christ's management of his Subjects on Earth: If it be Nonsence to say, Of such is the Happiness of the Saints in Glory; and it be good Sence to say, Of such is the Visible Church; then the visible Church is in part made up of little Children:

But it is Nonsence to apply it to all the other; and it is good Sence to say, Of such is the visible Church: *Ergo*

Ergo, The visible Church is in part made up of little Children.

Dr. Russel. There is so much Nonsence in this Argument, I know not well how to make Sence of it: It seems to me little to the purpose. But however, I will deny your *Minor*, and say, It is good Sence to say, that little Children belong to the Kingdom of Glory.

I pray observe (by the way) what sort of Subjects Mr. Leigh's *Church must consist of; if they have no Interest in the Graces of the Kingdom, nor yet in the Glory of the Kingdom.*

Mr Leigh. I say it's Nonsence to understand it otherwise.

And upon this he desired, that all those who were satisfied with what he had said should hold up their hands. And of that great Multitude, there was but a very few that did it: So that it was manifest they were not satisfied with what he had said.

Mr. Williams. Is it Nonsence then to say, that any Infants belong to the Kingdom of Glory?

Mr. Leigh. Yes, while they are in their Infant State; for when arrived to Glory, they are perfect as grown men, whatever they were on Earth. Otherwise we must say that there are Infants of two foot long, poor, weak, ignorant things in Glory: Therefore it must be thus taken, for we must make good Sence of Scripture.

Mr. Williams. I deny your *minor*, and shall form an opposite Argument thus:

If Infants are neither Members of the Universal visible Church, not yet of a particular constituted Church, then they are not members of the visible Church at all:

But they are neither members of the Universal visible Church, not yet of a particular constituted Church:

Therefore they are not members of the visible Church at all.

Mr. Leigh *took no notice of this Argument, but said,* It did not belong to a Respondent to form an Argument.

To which Mr. Williams *reply'd* My Work is to clear the Truth, I will not be ty'd up to your Rules of Disputation.

Mr. Robinson required an express prohibition of Infants Church membership.

Mr. Williams *reply'd*, That is fine indeed; Pray give us an express prohibition of baptizing with Cream, and Spittle, and Salt, and Oyl; and the use of the Cross in Baptism: (all which you reject) and of many things more that might be brought into the Worship of God. *And to this no Reply was made.*

Mr. Leigh *insisting again upon his Argument for excluding Infants out of the Kingdom of Heaven, from* Matth. 19. *affirming,* that

that from thence it was Nonsence to say, they were the Subjects of Glory.

Mr. Williams said, We must distinguish between a Title to Glory and the actual Enjoyment of Glory. Elect Infants have a Title to Glory, by Virtue of the Righteousness of Christ imputed unto them; although they are not actually in it.

In the next place Mr. *Williams* denied the *major*, and proved to him from *Matth.* 3. 7. That Church Membership could not be the ground of Baptism; because those many Pharisees and others, that came and offer'd themselves to *John* for Baptism, were Church-Members; and yet *John* denied to admit them to Baptism.

Here Mr. Leigh *distinguished between Church Members* de jure, *and such that were only so* de facto.

Mr. Williams asked him, whether he did own them to be Church-Members *de facto*.

His Answer was, He did.

Then Mr. Williams *told him* Church-Membership could not be the ground of Baptism.

Mr. Leigh. said, They were not so *de jure*, because they were a Generation of *Vipers*, and therefore ought by the Law to have been cast out.

But when Mr. *Williams* did desire him to tell him where that Law was written, he could not produce it.

Upon this Dr. *Russel* asked Mr. *Leigh*, what Relation this Argument of his had to the Commission? For he did not know that they were obliged to follow them any longer in answering such Impertinencies, that were not at all included in the Question. And therefore desired him to produce some Argument that was more consonant to the Point in Question, for this was foreign to it. For we have granted you more than you seem willing to desire, in favour of Infants; namely, That they have a Title both to Grace here, and Glory hereafter, through the Merits of Christ and his Righteousness imputed to them. And yet we cannot allow that they are the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission; or, a Part of the visible Church. Nevertheless we have very charitable Thoughts towards them, because we believe their Salvation is secured to them another way.

Mr. Leigh. *then proceeds to another Argument:*

If Infants are Disciples, then they have a Right to Baptism according to the Commission:

But Infants are Disciples:

Ergo, They have a Right to Baptism according to the Commission.

Mr. Williams denied the *minor*.

In

In defence of which, they argued from *Acts.* 15. 10. after this manner.

If those upon whom the Yoke of Circumcision was imposed after the manner of *Moses*, were called Disciples, and the manner of *Moses* was to Circumcise Infants; then Infants are called Disciples.

But those upon whom the Yoke of Circumcision was imposed after the manner of *Moses*, were called Disciples, and the manner of *Moses* was to circumcise Infants:

Ergo, Infants are called Disciples.

Dr. Russel. I both distinguish upon your *major*, and deny the consequence thereof. For I hope you understand a difference betwixt the *Manner* of performing an Action, and the *Subjects* upon whom it is performed.

The *Manner* of *Moses* is the thing here spoken of; which was to cut off the Foreskin of the Flesh with a Knife, a sharp Stone, or the like Instrument: And this was sometimes practised upon grown Persons, and sometimes upon Infants. As touching Infants, they are neither expressed, nor intended in the Scripture you have alledged. For they are called Brethren, Believing Gentiles, such that had an Epistle sent to them, and when they heard it read, they rejoiced at the Consolation, were establish'd in the Faith, and are called Churches; which your selves know (in those Times) consisted of Adult Persons, Multitudes both of Men and Women. But not of one infant that we read of among them. And indeed, none of those forementioned Characters can agree to little Infants.

Mr. *Leigh.* I grant the Manner is there spoken of, and the Subjects brought in afterwards. But would not the People conclude that Infants were intended, if I tell them it must be done after the manner of *Moses*?

Dr. Russel It's no matter what those People conclude, that know not how to distinguish between the Subjects, and the Manner. But those of whom this was spoken, knew right well, that the false Teachers imposed it upon the Gentiles that did believe: And they are the Subjects, here spoken of.

Mr. Leigh. I would form this Argument.

If those are called Disciples who are advised by Judaizing Christians to be circumcised after the Manner of *Moses*, then Infants are called Disciples:

But they are called Disciples that are advised so to be Circumcised:

Ergo, Infants are called Disciples.

Dr. Russel. denies the consequence of the *major*, for it doth not follow that because Adult Believers who are the Subjects there

there spoken of (as is already proved) are call'd Disciples; that therefore Infants, who are neither expressed, nor intended, must be so call'd. For Mr. *Leigh* hath allowed the Distinction betwixt the Subjects, and the Manner.

Mr. Leigh. Read the first Verse, and you will find, that there came Men from *Judea*, that taught the Gentile Church that believed, That unless they were circumcised after the Manner of *Moses*, they could not be saved, *&c.* It was the Yoke of Circumcision here intended.

Whereupon Mr. *Williams* did deny, that barely Circumcision was that intolerable Yoke, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear, that is there spoken of by *Peter*. For Circumcision, barely considered, Children of Eight Days old were able to bear it, and did bear it.

But Circumcision, as it obliged to the Law in Point of Justification, was that intolerable Yoke, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear. For the Apostle tells the *Galatians*; That if they were circumcised, Christ should profit them nothing; and that they were bound to keep the whole Law.

Now, altho' Circumcision, barely considered, might be imposed on Infants; yet the false Doctrine in which that intolerable Yoke did consist, together with Circumcision, could not be imposed on Children.

Besides, that Circumcision, after the Manner of *Moses*, did not respect the Subjects, but the Form. It was the Brethren that were the Subjects the false Teachers would have had to have been circumcised after the Manner of *Moses*; amongst which, Children could not be numbred.

For, 1*st*. They were such Brethren that had received the Holy Ghost.

2*dly*. They had purified their hearts by Faith.

3*dly*. They were such that from among the Gentiles were turned to God.

Then they went off also from this, and said, Infants are part of a Nation, and therefore might be baptized.

Mr. Williams replied, Though Children are part of a Nation; yet not of a Nation modified according to Christ's Commission.

Whereupon their Moderator said, He thought Mr. *Williams* had but little Academical Learning.

Mr. *Williams* replied, He was warned by the Word, to have a care of vain Philosophy. And presently demanded, what was the Antecedent to the Relative *them*, in the Commission.

The Moderator making no answer, Mr. *Williams* said, It was all Nations Discipled.

And upon this, Dr. *Russel*, and Mr. *Williams* did both desire them to produce one Instance for Infant-Baptism, out of the Word of God. And this they did very many times desire of them, but no Instance was produced. At length Mr. *Williams* desired them, in these words:

Brethren, I would beg you to produce one Instance for Infants Baptism; it will reflect upon you, if you do not. What will all this People say, when they are gone? So many times one Instance desired: So many Ministers here, and not one Instance produced: They must needs conclude there was not one to be produced.

Notwithstanding this, the Ministers were all silent; and not a Man did reply to it.

Then Mr. *Leigh* said, We might take up the Opponency again, if we pleased.

Thus ended their so much boasted of Opponency, in that vain-glorious Advertisement, publish'd in the *Post-Man*, the *Saturday* Morning after the Dispute, (either by one of themselves, or of their unthinking Admirers) before Dr. *Russel* could return to *London*, altho' he set forth from *Portsmouth* the next Morning after the Dispute; his pressing Occasions necessitating him thereto.

Dr. Russel did then, at Mr. *Leigh*'s Request, reassume the Opponency, of which Mr. *Leigh* seemed to be sick, and was willing to get rid of it. Which was a sign they had no mind to inform the People of the Grounds upon which they keep up the Practice of Infants Baptism; when they had so fair an Opportunity put into their Hands to do it, and made no better Improvement of it. But having no Scripture-Proof for it, they were not willing to let so great an Auditory know the true cause why they continue such a Scriptureless Practice, to say no worse of it.

Dr. Russel. I will therefore prove, that no Infants are to be baptized by virtue of Christ's Commission.

If αὐτὸς hath no other Antecedent agreeing therewith but μαθητεύσατε, then none are to be baptized but such as are first made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, which Infants are not capable of.

But the Antecedent is true; as is also the Consequence; and therefore no Infants are to be baptized.

Mr. Leigh. I deny that αὐτὸς hath no other Antecedent but μαθητεύσατε. *Dr. Russel.*

Dr. Ruſſel. If there be another, pray aſſign it.

Mr. Leigh. I ſay it is πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *All Nations.*

Dr. Ruſſel. That cannot poſſibly be; becauſe αὐτὰς, *Them*, is of the Maſculine Gender, and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *All Nations*, is of the Neuter Gender. But αὐτὰς, *Them*, doth very well agree with μαθητὰς, *Diſciples*, they being both of the Maſculine Gender.

To this they gave no ſolid Anſwer, worthy of noting down, according to my remembrance, or the Notaries Obſervation.

Dr. Ruſſel having obſerved what evaſive Anſwers they had given to his own and Mr. *William*'s Arguments, was reſolved to force them to a direct Anſwer (if poſſible) by retorting their own Allegation upon themſelves, that they might ſee the Abſurdity of it: and this put them into a flame, and great confuſion.

The Argument was this:

If Infants are capable to be made Diſciples of Chriſt, by the Miniſtry of Men, without the uſe of Reaſon, then the Beaſts of the Field are alſo capable: but the Beaſts of the Field are not capable: therefore Infants are not capable.

Upon this there was a great Diſorder among them, and a Perſon in the Company cried out, *He ſpeaks Blaſphemy.* But one of the Miniſters that ſat by him was ſo juſt, as to ſatisfie him to the contrary; for which he deſerves Thanks.

But Mr. *Robinſon*, their Moderator, ſtood up, and threw himſelf about, making a noiſe like one in a delirious Paroxyſm; and bid the People take notice, that Dr. *Ruſſel* had ranked their Infants among the brute Beaſts; and that if they became of his Opinion, they muſt look upon them as Dogs, or Cats, or Hogs, *&c.* with much more of the ſame ſort of Rhetorick; endeavouring all he could to enrage the multitude of unthinking Perſons againſt him, and put the People into a confuſion.

Upon this, Mr. *Sharp*, the Baptiſt Moderator, ſtood up, and ſaid, Gentlemen, hold! what is to do now? What, doth Colonel *Self* ride Lord-General in the Town of *Portſmouth* to day? What is the reaſon of this?

Dr. Ruſſel. Hold, Mr. *Robinſon*: Muſt I be thus miſrepreſented to the People, becauſe I ſay (that which you all know to be true) that Infants want the uſe of Reaſon? I hope you will be quiet a little time, and give me leave to make my Defence to the People againſt your clamorous Expreſſions.

I am now put upon a neceſſity to tell this Aſſembly (of honourable Perſons, and others) what my Thoughts are concerning the ſtate of Mankind in general, and of little Infants in particular.

I believe, that Man, as he came out of the hands of God, was a noble Creature, the top Perfection of all his Creation here below, and was substituted Lord of this lower World; was endowed with the Image of his Maker, both Natural and Divine.

But by his Sin he lost the Divine Image, and brought himself thereby under the Curse, and into a State of Condemnation, in which his Posterity were also involved.

But it pleased God, of his infinite Mercy, not to leave him in that miserable estate, as he had left the fallen Angels. But Christ interposed between Justice and the Sinner, the Promise being made before the Sentence was pronounced, *Gen.* 3. 15. *That the seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's head.* And this promised Seed hath (through the Grace of God) opened a door of mercy for little Infants, who never sinned in their own persons; as well as for others.

And you know, Gentlemen, I have already told you how great an Esteem I have for your little Infants; that I will rather believe that all Infants dying in their Infancy are elected, than I will conclude that any one of them are damn'd: And this is more than I could persuade our Opposites to confess, although they were urged upon it.

So that (for ought yet appears) we have a greater esteem for your tender Babes, than these Gentlemen have, notwithstanding Mr. *Robinson*'s unreasonable Clamour against me. And having thus Apologized for my self, I do now expect an Answer to my Argument.

Mr. Robinson. What a strange thing is this, to talk of baptizing the Beasts of the Field! Whoever did so?

Dr. Russel. I am so far from talking of baptizing the Beasts of the Field, that my Argument is rather to prove the direct contrary. And whereas you affirm that Infants have a Capacity to be made Disciples of Christ, by the Ministry of Men, (or else you have been saying nothing to the purpose all this time about it) I bring this to shew you the Absurdity of such a Notion: And you are bound to shew the Disparity, or confess you cannot.

Sirs, I would put this Case to you; Suppose there were twenty or thirty new-born Infants in a Room, and you should chuse out the most able and learned Person among you to preach to them, in order to make them Disciples according to Christ's Commission; I believe he would have no better success than St. *Anthony* had (as the Story goes) when he took upon him to instruct the Pigs; or, as some others have done (even Popish Saints) who have took upon them to preach to

the

the Fowls of the Air, *&c.* of which I could furnish you with divers Instances.

But why should Mr. *Robinson* think it strange that any body should have such a conceit in their minds? Doth he not know that the Church of *Rome* baptize things of an inferiour Nature; for they baptize Churches and Bells.

And if I had compared your Practice to theirs of baptizing Bells, you had had no reason to complain, for they are both passive in the Act; only if you will give credit to one of the Fathers (viz. *Augustine*) the Bells are upon that account the fittest Subjects, for they are wholly passive: but (saith he) the little Children are not so: for they shew their Resistance by their Crying. And now I demand of any of you to take off the Retortion, and shew the Disparity if you can.

Upon this they were all silent, and none of them would undertake to shew the Disparity: and till they do it, my Retortion will remain upon them.

Then Mr. *Leigh* said, It is time to proceed to the other Question.

Dr. Russel. I will now enter upon it.

The second Question is this:

Whether the Ordinance of Baptism, as appointed by Christ, is to be administred by Dipping, Plunging, (or) *Overwhelming only, and not otherwise?*

I take the Question in the Affirmative, and my first Argument is this.

Arg. 1. The Holy Scripture shews us the right way of Baptizing, as appointed by Christ:

But it doth not shew us that it ought to be done by Sprinkling:

Ergo, Sprinkling is not the right way of Baptizing.

Mr. Leigh. Sir, you must bring in, that Dipping is absolutely necessary, (as in the Question.) What do you talk of Sprinkling for?

Dr. Russel. Sir, I know not of any other way that is practised by you; nor, I suppose any of these People: I conclude, they have often seen you sprinkle Infants; and Mr. *Chandler* hath particularly recommended it in his Preaching, as the best way of Baptizing: and I hope you are not asham'd of your Practice.

But if you will disown Sprinkling to be the right way of Baptizing, I am contented; I will not then insist upon it.

Mr. Robinson. We are not discoursing of that now: you are to prove Dipping to be the only way; and you must and shall prove it.

Dr. Russel.

Dr. Ruſſel. Muſt and Shall! Muſt and Shall is for the King, and not for Mr. *Robinſon.*

Mr. Leigh. But we will not admit of this Argument, becauſe it hath not the word *Only* in it. You are to prove that your Way is the only right way of Baptizing.

Dr. Ruſſel. Mr. *Leigh* was pleaſed to make uſe of an Argument of Induction upon the Queſtion about the *Subjects*: and why may not I uſe the ſame liberty about the *Manner*, and prove it by Arguments of Induction?

Upon this ſome of them fell a laughing, and Mr. *Chandler* thus expreſs'd himſelf; *Your Induction is an Induction like the man's Covey of Partridges.*

Mr. Williams ask'd him how many there was in the Covey?

Mr. Chandler ſaid, Why there was but one.

Mr. Williams replied, But there was more a hatching.

Dr. Ruſſel. What is the reaſon of all this? I tell you, I will make it good by Arguments of Induction: And if you do not underſtand my meaning, I will inform you, and ſhew that it is a good way of Arguing, and will anſwer the End I bring it for.

For, I will firſt argue off your way of Sprinkling; and after that, if you ſhall aſſign a *Third* way, that is neither practiſed by you nor us, I will then argue that off alſo: and then (I hope) I ſhall fully prove what I deſign by it; namely, that ours is the *only* right way of Baptizing.

Upon this they readily diſcerned they ſhould be forced to give an Inſtance from Scripture for their Practice of Sprinkling, which they were conſcious to themſelves they were not able to do: and therefore utterly refuſed to anſwer the Argument.

Dr. Ruſſ. If this Argument will not be admitted, I will proceed to another.

That Way which doth not ſignifie that which ought to be repreſented in Baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Appointment, is not the right way of Baptizing.

But this your pretended way doth not do;

Ergo, It is not the right way of Baptizing.

And this I ſhall make good by the following Syllogiſm.

If that Baptiſm which was appointed by Chriſt, doth properly repreſent his Burial and Reſurrection, and ours by him, then it muſt be done not by Sprinkling, but by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming the Perſon baptized into Water:

But that *Baptiſm* which was appointed by Chriſt, doth properly repreſent his Burial and Reſurrection, and ours by him:

Ergo, It muſt be done not by Sprinkling, but by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming the Perſon baptized into Water.

Mr. Chand-

Mr. Chandler. I deny the consequence of the *major*; that it properly sets forth a Burial and a Resurrection. It is not for this Reason the *only* Way; and I deny that this Way doth only set forth a Burial and a Resurrection.

Dr. Russel Then I will prove,

1. That it doth truly represent a Burial and a Resurrection. And,

2. That it is the only right way of practising this Ordinance.

1. That it doth represent a Burial and a Resurrection, I prove from *Rom.* 6. and *Colos.* 2. In *Rom.* 6. 4. *Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up*, &c. *Colos.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him*, &c.

This cannot be understood literally; for so they were not, could not be buried with him in his Sepulchre, neither can we. But the Apostle resolves us how this was done, and how they were, and we may, be buried with him, and also rise with him, and that is by Baptism. *Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him.* Therefore Baptism is to be performed in such a way that represents a Burial and a Resurrection; which is most aptly represented by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming the Person baptized into the Water, and raising him up again out of it.

2. That this is the only right way of performing this Ordinance, I prove thus:

If there were no other way practised by *John the Baptist*, Christ, nor his Apostles, but what did represent a Burial and a Resurrection, then ours is the only right way of Baptizing.

But there was no other way practised by *John the Baptist*, Christ, nor his Apostles, but what did represent a Burial and a Resurrection:

Ergo, Ours is the only right way of Baptizing.

Mr. Chandler. You are to prove. That because Baptism is significant of a Burial and Resurrection, therefore it must be done only by Dipping.

Dr. Russel. By this Mr. *Chandler* grants, that Baptism doth signifie a Burial and Resurrection; and I have already proved that therefore it is the only right way of Baptizing that we practise, because there was no other practised in those first Times of the Gospel. And till he gives an Instance to the contrary, my Proof stands good.

But I shall farther prove it by this Argument:

If there can no Instance be given that ever the Apostles did baptize other ways than by Dipping, then ours is the right Way of Baptizing.

But

But there can be no Instance given, that ever the Apostles did baptize other ways than by Dipping:

Ergo, Ours is the right way of baptizing.

Mr. Leigh. I deny the Enumeration in your Argument; for it doth not follow, that because the Apostles did not practise it any other way, that there were no others that did. For there were divers other Ministers in those Times, besides the Apostles, that did also baptize.

Dr. Russel. By this you grant, that the Apostles of our Lord did not practise Baptism any other way than by Dipping. And to prove that no others did use a different Practice, I thus argue:

If we have no Account in Holy Scripture, that either the Apostles. or any other Ministers in those Times, did baptize any one Person other ways than by Dipping, then Dipping is the only right way of Baptizing.

But we have no Account in Holy Scripture, that either the Apostles, or any other Ministers in those Times, did baptize any one Person other ways than by Dipping:

Ergo, Dipping is the only right way of Baptizing.

Mr. Chandler. I can shew there is another way that it might be done, and not by Dipping; and that from the Etymology of the word *Baptizo*, for it signifies also *to wash*.

Dr. Russel. I remember what *Alstedius* saith in his *Lexicon Theologicum*. Having before been speaking about the Etymology of that word; *Illud* βαπτίζειν *tantum significat immergere, non lavare, nisi ex consequenti*; and therefore it signifies *to wash* only in a secondary and remote sence; because things that are dipp'd, may be said to be wash'd. But the proper and primary signification of *Baptizo*, is, *to dip*; for it comes from βάπτω, *mergo*, *immergo*, to *dip*, to *plunge*, to *overwhelm*, to *dip into*, &c.

Mr. Chandler. I own that Βάπτω signifies *mergo*, *immergo*: But I can shew great probability, that many, in Scripture-times, were baptized, by pouring a little Water on the Face; and there is no certainty that Dipping was ever used.

Dr. Russel. How doth that appear?

Mr. Leigh. We will argue on a Probability: It might be done otherways than by Dipping; and a Probability is the most you can pretend to for Dipping. I require you to prove that Dipping was certainly intended in those places you bring for it; and then I will prove, that Dipping was not intended, but only an Application of Water to the Person.

Dr. Russel. The first Instance I shall give, is the Baptism of our Saviour, as it is express'd in *Mark* 1. 9. *Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.* The words

are,

are, Καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. Which words do certainly signifie that he was Dipped *into* Jordan.

Dr. Leigh. The Word εἰς signifies *in*, as well as *into*, and is often so Translated in the New Testament.

Dr. Russel. That it may sometimes so signify where the Scope of the place may shew it, I will not contend. But you know very well, that where it is joined with an Accusative (as it is here) it signifies *into*. And I can shew that our Translators have so rendred it in many places in the New Testament. And it would many times be Nonsence to understand it otherwise. I will give you some Instances of it, in the room of many that might be given.

As in *John* 3. 17. *God sent not his Son* into the *World to condemn the World; but that the World through him might be saved.* Here εἰς is rendred *into*: For the Words in theGreek are εἰς τὸν κόσμον; and I hope you will not deny that God sent Christ *into* the World.

And in 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *Christ Jesus came into the World to save Sinners*, &c. There εἰς is also Translated *into*. And I hope you will not deny, *that Christ came into the World to save Sinners.* It's joined with the same Words as in *John* 3. 17. before recited.

And in *Luke* 4. 16. it's said, *He went* into *the Synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read.* Here again it is so rendred; for the Words are, εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν, into *the Synagogue. And the eyes of all them that were in the Synagogue were fastned on him*, ver. 20. which could not have been, had he not gone *into* the Synagogue, as it's manifest he did. And I hope you will not deny that Christ went into the Synagogue: But you may do it with as much colour of Reason, as to say he was not Dip'd or Plunged of *John* into the River of *Jordan*, when the same Word is used in the same Sense. And besides, if we do but consider those multitudes that *John* Baptized in the River of *Jordan*, and other places where there was much Water; we have no reason to doubt of the Truth thereof.

Mr. Leigh. We allow, that what cannot be used without being burdensome, might be more commodious in that Day, and observed in that hot Country of *Judæa*, when there was so many came to *John* to be Baptized; and therefore it may be that they went out to Rivers. But I will argue upon a probability. It is well known, in those hot Countries the People wore Sandals; and they might go *into* the Water a little way to wash their Feet. Now I offer this fair Interpretation: They might step a little way *into* Jordan for Ease and Refreshment, and then *John* might pour a little Water on them.

Now allow but the Word Βαπτίζω to signifie *to wash*, as we can easily prove it is often so taken in Scripture; and I offer to all the Company, whether this be not a fair Interpretation of the Place, That *John* washed him with Water, he going a little way into *Jordan*.

Dr. Russel. Notwithstanding this Flourish of a pretended Probability, you know that the Word Βαπτίζω doth properly signify *to Dip*, as all the great Lexicographers and Criticks do tell us; and that its proper and native Signification is to Dip *into* Water, or to Plunge under Water; and that I could give you many Instances of, out of *Scapula*, *Stephanus*, *Shrevelius*, and many others. And they also tell us, That if it be used for Washing, it is in a remote Sense; and if it be taken in its primary Sense, it's such a washing as is by Dipping or Plunging into the Water, and being covered therewith.

But that you may see I am not singular in my Opinion, I will shew you that your own Expositors do thus render it, and some of the greatest Men among the Protestants that ever wrote since the Reformation; of which I have made a Collection out of their own Works, because I would not wrong them.

I shall begin with the Testimony of those Learned and Judicious Divines of your own Perswasion, who were those that connued Mr. *Pool*'s Annotations upon *Matth.* 3. 6. These are their own Words, *Were Baptized*, that is, *Dipped in Jordan.*

Upon *John* 3. 22, 23. There *John* was Baptizing, because this *Ænon* was a Brook or River that had *much* Water. It is from this apparent, that both Christ and *John* Baptized by Dipping the Body in the Water; else they need not have sought Places where had been a great plenty of Water.

Before Dr. *Russel* had read this last Sentence wholly out, the Presbyterian Ministers, even Mr. *Leigh* himself, as well as the rest of them, fell a hissing so loud, and set others of their Party to make a noise also by their ill Example, that altho' Dr. *Russel* went on with his Work, yet the Noise was so great, that it wholly drowned his Voice, that he could not be heard.

Whereupon Mr. *Sharp* the Moderator, call'd out aloud to still this great Noise, and spoke to this effect: What is the reason of this Hissing? Gentlemen, are you not ashamed? You preach to others the Doctrine of Sanctification and Self-denial, and to act thus your selves, I am asham'd to see it. I pray, good People, take no notice of it now.

When Dr. *Russel* perceived they would not forbear this Hissing and uncivil Carriage, he forebore to read any farther. And when Silence was obtained, he addressed himself to the Ministers after this manner:

Sirs, What is the matter with you? Muſt I not be permitted to recite your own Authors, and ſome of the greateſt Men that have written ſince the Reformation? Although their Teſtimony againſt us is of little value, becauſe they are Parties in the Controverſie; yet when the clear evidence of Truth ſhall enforce a Confeſſion from their Pens that we are in the right, it is then a great Teſtimony for us.

Here is firſt of all *Pool*'s Annotators, certain learned and judicious Divines, that ſay in that matter as we do: and they are Men of your own Party. There is alſo Dr. *Hammond* ſaith the ſame.

Here the *Doctor* was interrupted again, and they cried out, What do you tell us of Dr. *Hammond?* What have we to do with Dr. *Hammond?*

Dr. Ruſſel. Why certainly, Gentlemen, Dr. *Hammond* is not thus to be deſpiſed upon his Judgment about a Greek word. I have alſo Mr. *Baxter*, *Wollebius*, *Tilenus*, the Learned *Perkins*, and *Luther* alſo, who was againſt Sprinkling, and practiſed Dipping; and ſo did the reſt of the Divines at *Wittenburg*. Mr. *Calvin* alſo, although he did allow a Liberty of Sprinkling in cold Climates, yet he ſaith as I do as to the Signification of the word *Baptizo*, that it ſignifies to *Dip*, and was ſo uſed in the Primitive Church.

There is alſo the *Dutch* Tranſlators, they do every where render the words that are uſed to expreſs this Ordinance by, as we do; and they call *John the Baptiſt*, Joannes de Dooper, *John the Dipper*. And I know not of any place but it's ſo expreſt. And theſe are Presbyterians, Men of your own Religion.

Upon this, one of the Miniſters ſaid, What! do you underſtand *Dutch?*

Dr. Ruſſel ſaid, Yes, he underſtood it, but he could not ſpeak it readily.

They replied, We will try that; for we have a Gentleman here that underſtands *Dutch* very well.

Dr. Ruſſel. You may ask that Gentleman if you think fit; he can ſatisfie you, that what I ſay is true. But they had more Diſcretion than to call the Gentleman out to confute themſelves.

Dr. Ruſſel. I have alſo the Teſtimony of the *Dutch* Annotators, who ſay the ſame thing. And theſe alſo are Men of your own Perſuaſion.

And, to add no more, I have alſo the Teſtimony of the Aſſembly of Divines, ſitting at *Weſtminſter*: And I hope they may be of ſome credit with you.

But they would not suffer him to proceed in the Reading thereof to the People; but cried out, We are Protestants, and will not pin our Faith on other Mens sleeves.

Dr. Russel. What! not the Assembly of Divines? I thought, though you had no regard to my words, you might have had some regard to the Assembly of Divines. You know I do not wrong these Authors: And therefore what must the People think of you, to oppose your selves thus against these great Men, and such multitudes of them, that are of your own Persuasion (as many of them are) and the rest, some of the greatest Men since the Reformation. Surely the People cannot take it kindly at your hands, to reject the Authority of these Men in a matter of this Nature.

Their Answer was, We do reverence these Divines, but adhere to what they say, no farther than it agrees with the Word of God.

Dr. Russel. We say, that in this Particular, what they have written doth agree with the Word of God.

Mr. Leigh. You have recourse to the prime Signification of the Word, whereas we must take it according to its Acceptation in Scripture. And I offer it to the Consideration of the Learned, whether the prime Signification of the Word be a sufficient Argument in this case? And here he makes his Rhetorical Excursions about a Mathematician, an Angel, a Footboy that carries a Letter, a Physician, *&c.* and concludes thus, but we must go to the Scripture Acceptation of the Word. And I challenge you to bring one place of Scripture where it must be understood that it was done by Dipping.

Dr. Russel. It is very well, Mr. *Leigh* will allow that I have given the People the proper Meaning of the word Βαπτίζω, and that its prime Signification is *to Dip.* Now he might have spared all the rest that he hath said; for we do not lay the stress only upon the Etymology of the Word, but also upon the concurrent Testimonies of Holy Scripture, that it was so understood and so practised by *John the Baptist*, Christ, and his Apostles, and so represented by the Metaphors made use of (as a Burial and a Resurrection) to set it forth by: as also their choosing places where there was much Water to Baptize in, as I have already shewed, so far as they would permit me; and should have made it manifest beyond exception, if I might have been heard.

But to answer your Demand, I alledge *Acts* 8. 38, 39. *And they went both down into the Water, both* Philip *and the* Eunuch, *and he Baptized him. And when they were come up out of the Water,* &c. Here we have an account, that both the Administra-

tor,

tor, and the Person to be Baptized, went both down into the Water: and when they came there, he Baptized him. And if *Philip* had not been to put the *Eunuch* into the Water, and cover him with it, why should they go down both into the Water? A little of it might have been brought up to them into the Chariot, if Sprinkling would have served the turn. But it appears manifestly, that nothing less would serve for to answer the Commission, but to Dip the Person Baptized into the Water, otherwise they did that which was wholly needless, and besides the Rule that was given them to practise by. And their coming up again out of the Water, doth evidently shew that he was Plunged into it, and overwhelm'd with it.

Mr. *Leigh* replied, That the Greek word signified to go down *to*, and come up *from* the Water.

Mr. *Williams* replied, That there was two differing Words (as he had been informed) in the Greek Text; as there are two different Words in the Translation. For it is said, *As they went on their way, they came* unto *a certain Water:* This was before he proposed for Baptism. But when a Grant was given him that he might be Baptized, it is then said, *They went down both of them* into *the Water, and* Philip *Baptized him there.* Now, as they are different Words in the Translation, coming *unto* and going *down into*, even so they are differing Words in the Greek.

Dr. Russel said, They were two different Words; to which Mr. *Leigh* conceded.

But after the Meeting was over, Mr. *Williams* the Presbyterian Minister, in whose Meeting place the Dispute was, told Mr. *Williams* the Baptist Disputant, he was in the right, and that they were two differing Words in the Greek; one for coming *unto*, the other for going down *into*.

Dr. Russel. I then farther argue:

If the Spirit of God doth never use the Word Ῥάντισμα where the Ordinance of Baptism is mentioned, but always expresses it by Βάπτισμα; then it was performed by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only: But the Spirit of God doth never use the word Ῥάντισμα where the Ordinance of Baptism is mentioned, but always expresses it by Βάπτισμα;

Ergo, It was performed by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only.

Mr. Chandler. I deny the Sequel of the *Major*; because the Word doth sometimes signifie a Washing, that is short of Dipping.

Dr. Russel. You must then assign your Instance.

Mr.

Mr. Chandler. You must know that Βαπτίζω comes from טבל *Tabal.* And I will shew that it denotes such a Washing as is short of Dipping. And in *Dan.* 4. 33. where it is said of Nebuchadnezzar, *His body was wet with the dew of Heaven*; the *Septuagint* render it Βαπτίζω: so that it cannot be understood in your sense.

Dr. Russel. That Βαπτίζω is used in the stead of *Tabal*, is true. But how do you know that the Word was so Rendred by the *Septuagint*?

Mr. Chandler. It is so in that Translation that goes in their Name.

Dr. Russel. That I deny; for the Word there is *Ebaphe*, and not *Baptizo.* But do you not know what *Weemes* saith in his *Christian Synagogue*, That the *Septuagint* Translation was burnt, and only some Fragments of it remaining, which was made up by others: so that neither you nor I know when we read the *Septuagint*, and when we read other Men. But what doth all this signify? That is but a Translation, and I think ours to be much better than that, if it were as you say; and more agreeable to the scope of the place to say, *his body was wet with the dew of Heaven*, than to say, *it was dipt with the dew of Heaven.*

But I pray let Mr. *Chandler* tell us how it is in the *Hebrew*, which is the Language in which it was written.

Mr. Chandler. The Word in the Hebrew is *Tabal.*

Dr. Russel. That I deny.

Whereupon an Hebrew Bible was produced, and handed up to Dr. *Russel:* And the Book of *Daniel* not being placed in its right Order, as in other Hebrew Bibles, he did not readily find it; whereupon they cryed out, They believ'd he could not read it. The Dr. answered, He could read Hebrew before Mr. *Chandler* was born: and as a demonstration of it, he read a Verse or two in the beginning thereof. Upon this Mr. *Robinson* took the Book and with some difficulty found out the Book of *Daniel*, and then gave it to Dr. *Russel* again, who read the Place by them directed to, and told Mr. *Chandler* that the Word *Tabal* was not there. And then, after all this needless trouble, Mr. *Chandler* did confess that it was not: and so all his Pretension from thence vanished into Smoak.

Mr. *Chandler* also urged for another instance, to prove that *Tabal* signified a Washing less than that by Dipping, 2 *Kings* 5. 10, 14. *Go and wash in Jordan, and be clean.* And in Verse 14. *He dipped himself in Jordan.* Now this must signifie a Washing short of Dipping; because though *Tabal* doth express the Act done in Ver. 14. yet the Command is given by *Rachatz*, which signifies *to wash.*

Dr.

Dr. Ruſſel. I do allow that the Command is expreſt by *Rachatz*, and alſo that it ſometimes is uſed, as well as *Cabas*, to ſignifie leſs than Dipping when it is applied to ſome particular things, or parts of things, which are to be cleanſed from Filth; as you know νίπτω in the Greek is *to waſh the Hands.*

But where *Rachatz* in the Hebrew is uſed in the Sence as it is here expreſt, namely, *to waſh himſelf*; it is always to be underſtood of ſuch a Waſhing as is by Dipping. The *Jews* underſtood it ſo, and *Naaman* the *Syrian* underſtood the Prophet in that Sence; for it is ſaid, he dipped himſelf in *Jordan* ſeven times. And that he was not miſtaken about it, is evident; for that the Spirit of God hath left it upon Record, that what he did was according to the Saying of the Man of God: ſo that the Prophet did not intend by *Rachatz* any other Waſhing than what is perform'd by Dipping of the Perſon ſo waſhed into the Water. And had this been a Derivative, there might have been ſome doubt raiſed about it; but ſeeing *Tabal* is the Root it ſelf, it can ſignify nothing leſs than what is the known ſence thereof, *viz.* He Dipped. He dipped himſelf in *Jordan* ſeven times, according to the Saying of the Man of God. Thus I have cleared this Text from your Objection, as not intending any ſuch thing as you have brought it for, but the direct contrary.

Then Mr. *Chandler* ſaid, We challenge you to prove, by Scripture, that the Word *Baptizo* ſignifies *to Dip*, and that *that* is intended by Baptiſm.

Dr. Ruſſel. I will prove it from all the Places where the Ordinance of *Baptiſm* is ſpoken of, if you will let me prove it from the Greek.

Mr. Chandler. No, you ſhall prove it from our Tranſlation, that it is there any where ſo rendred; but you ſhall not do it from any of thoſe Places where the Ordinance of *Baptiſm* is ſpoken of.

Dr. Ruſſel. That is unreaſonable, that when the Uſe of a Word is enquired into, and what was the Practice of the firſt Miniſters, purſuant to that Word by which they are commanded to Baptize; for all thoſe Scriptures where it is ſo mentioned to be excluded out of our Enquiry.

Mr. Chandler. I will not allow you to prove it from any of thoſe Places where the Ordinance of Baptiſm is either expreſt or intended.

Dr. Buſſel. If nothing elſe will do with you, I will then undertake to prove from divers places in Scripture, that either *Bapto*, or its Derivatives, is ſo rendred in our *Engliſh* Tranſlation.

The first Scripture I shall instance in, is,

Rev. 19. 13. *He was cloathed with a Vesture dipped in Blood.*

Mr. Chandler. This is not *Bapto.*

Dr. *Russel.* No more is *Baptizo, Baptismos, Baptisma,* &c. but they are all Derivatives from it; and so is the Word that is here used. And this Mr. *Chandler* did not deny.

Dr. *Russel* did then urge the several Places in the Evangelists about *Judas* dipping with Christ in the Dish; as, Matt. 26. 23. *He that dippeth.* Mark 14. 20. John 13. 26. *When I have dipped it. And when he had dipped,* &c. Now in all these Places you see it's thus rendred, and the Ordinance of Baptism not in the least intended.

Moreover, I will give you one Instance more, in which the most minute Action imaginable is intended, and yet so much as was put into the Water is said to be dipt.

Luke 16. 24. Where the rich Man being in Hell, desired Father *Ambram* to send *Lazarus,* that *he might dip the tip of his Finger in Water, to cool his Tongue,* &c.

By this it appears, that our Translators did thus understand the Word to intend Dipping; and have never rendred it to Sprinkle in all the New Testament.

I would only add, That when Learned Men come to have but the same Wisdom as the *Jewish* Rabbies have, to reduce all doubtful Words to their Roots and Theme from whence they are derived, then much of our present Disputes will issue in the Knowledge of the Truth; and we shall cease to strive about Words to no Profit, but to the subverting of the Hearers.

Upon this followed a confused Jangling and Noise, so that the Amanuensis could not take it down, neither did he think it worth the taking.

But Mr. *Williams,* the Presbyterian Minister, said, he thought there had been little said to the Purpose.

Upon this Dr. *Russel* said, Mr. *Williams,* I think there hath been a great deal said more than hath been answered; but if you are not satisfied, we will wave all that hath been said, and I will dispute it over with you *de novo.*

Mr. *Williams* shrugged, and answered, No; I am not very well.

Although he had not been engaged at all in the Dispute himself, and the Doctor had been fatigued by so long a Disputation, yet Mr. *Williams* refused to accept his Offer.

It was at last thought meet by them to put an Issue to the Disputation. And Mr. *Leigh* (after he had made a Speech to thank the Governour and the Mayor for their Civility towards them,

them, and the Baptists had returned their Thanks also) he then concluded in Prayer; and so dismist the Assembly. It was between the Hours of Six and Seven of the Clock when the Dispute ended.

I do now think it proper to give you an Account of those Learned Mens Testimonies to justifie our Practice of Dipping, which Dr. *Russel* was then prevented to recite, by reason of the Ministers Hissing, and the Noise and Clamour of their Party, that would not suffer him to be heard.

Pool's *Annotations.*

Matt. 3. 6. *Were Baptized*: that is, Dipped in *Jordan.*

Matt. 28. 19. It's true, the first Baptisms of which we read in Holy Writ, were by Dipping of the Persons Baptized. Where it may be we judge it reasonable, and most resembling our Burial with Christ by Baptism into Death.

John 3. 22, 23. There *John* was Baptizing, because this *Ænon* was a Brook or River that had much Water. It is from this apparent, that both Christ and *John* Baptized by Dipping the Body in the Water; else they need not have sought Places where had been a great Plenty of Water.

Acts 8. 38. In hot Countries this was usual, to Baptize by Dipping the Body in the Water.

Rom. 6. 4. He seems here to allude to the manner of Baptizing in those warm Eastern Countries, which was to Dip or Plunge the Party Baptized; and, as it were, to bury him for a while *under* Water.

Dr. Hammond's *Annotations.*

Matt. 3. *John* put the Persons whom he Baptized into the Water, Dipped them all over, and so took them out again And in his Paraphrase on

Mark 1. 5. And *John*'s Baptism was done in *Jordan*, a River convenient for that Purpose.

The Learned Perkins.

Rom. 6. The ancient Custom of Baptizing was to dip, and as it were to dive all the Body of the Baptized in the Water, as may appear in *Paul*, *Rom.* 6. And the Councils of *Laodicea*, and *Neocæsarea*. The Action of the Minister, is his Washing of the Party Baptized with the Element of Water.

Of washing there be three Part: The putting into the Water, the continuance in the Water and the coming out of the Water. *Perkins*'s Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, *Cap.* 33. *Pag.* 74. *Vol.* 1.

And in his Comment on *Galat.* 3. 27. *Vol.* 2. *Pag.* 257. the Dipping of the Body signifies Mortification, or Fellowship with Christ in his Death: The staying under the Water, signifies the Burial of Sin: And the coming out of the Water, the Resurrection from Sin to Newness of Life.

And upon *Matth.* 28. 19. Here (saith he) a Question may be made, Whether Washing the Body in Baptism, must be by Dipping or Sprinkling? His Answer is this; In hot Countries, and in the Baptism of Men of Years, Dipping was used, and that by the Apostles: And to this *Paul* alludes, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. And Dipping doth more fully represent our spiritual Washing, than Sprinkling. *Ibid. Pag.* 257.

Mr. Baxter, *in his Paraphrase.*

Matth. 3. 5. We grant that Baptism then was by washing the whole Body.

Matth. 3. 6. Baptism was in *John*'s time, by washing the whole Body.

Rom. 6. 4. Therefore in our Baptism we are dipped *under* the Water.

Coloss 2. 12. Ye are dead and buried with him; for so your Baptism signifies, in which ye are put under the Water, to signifie and profess that your Old Man, or fleshly Lust, is dead and buried with him; and you rise thence, to signifie and profess, that you rise to Newness of Life.

In his third Argument against Mr. *Blake*, he saith, *quoad modum*, with respect to the manner, It is commonly confest by us to the Anabaptists (as our Commentators declare) that in the Apostles time, the Baptized were dipped over Head in Water. And though we have thought it lawful to disuse the manner of Dipping, yet we presume not to change the Use and Signification of it.

Dr. *Cave.*

In his *Primitive Christianity*, Pag. 320. saith, That the Party Baptized was wholly immerged, or put under Water; which was the almost constant and universal Custom of those times whereby they did most notably and significantly express the great End and Effects of Baptism; for as in immerging there are in a manner three several Acts, the putting the Person into

Water

Water, his abiding there for ſome time, and his riſing up again, thereby repreſenting Chriſt's Death, Burial, and Reſurrection, *&c.*

Dr. Nicholſon, *late Lord Biſhop of* Glouceſter.

In his *Expoſition of the Church-Catechiſm*, ſaith, in *Pag.* 174. And the ancient manner in Baptiſm, the putting the Perſon Baptized under the Water, and then taking him out again, did well ſet out theſe two Acts, the firſt his dying, the ſecond his riſing again. And in the ſame Pag, upon *Col.* 2. 12. he ſaith, In the Grave with Chriſt we went not, for our Bodies were not, could not be buried with his; but in our Baptiſm, by a kind of Analogy or Reſemblance, while our Bodies are *under* the Water, we may be ſaid to be buried with him.

Dr. Fowler, *preſent Lord Biſhop of* Glouceſter.

In his *Scope of the Chriſtian Religion*, upon *Rom.* 6. 4. ſaith, Chriſtians being plunged into the Water in Baptiſm, ſignifieth their undertaking and obliging themſelves, in a ſpiritual Senſe to die and be buried with Jeſus Chriſt, that ſo anſwerably to his Reſurrection, they may live a holy and godly Life.

Dr. Tillotſon, *late Archbiſhop of* Canterbury.

In his *Sermon upon* 2 Tim 2. 19. ſaith, Anciently thoſe who were Baptized put off their Garments, which ſignified the putting off the Body of Sin; and were immerſed and buried in the Water, to repreſent the Death of Sin; and then did riſe up again out of the Water, to ſignifie their Entrance upon a new Life. And to theſe Cuſtoms the Apoſtle alludes, *Rom.* 6. 4.

Dr. Jer. Taylor, *late Lord Biſhop of* Down,

In his *Ductor Dubitantium*, lib. 3. cap. 4. ſaith, The Cuſtom of the ancient Church was not Sprinkling, but Immerſion, in Purſuance of the ſenſe of the word Βαπτίζοντες, both in the Commandment and Example of our bleſſed Saviour. And this agrees with the Myſtery of the Sacrament it ſelf; for [illegible]e buried with him in Baptiſm (ſaith the Apoſtle.) The old Man is buried and drowned in the Immerſion *under* Water; and when the Baptized Perſon is lifted up from the Water, it repreſents the Reſurrection of the New Man to Newneſs of Life.

The Learned Joseph Mede,

In his *Diatribe on Titus* 3. 5. saith, There was no such thing as Sprinkling used in Baptism in the Apostles time, nor many Ages after them.

Mr. Daniel Rogers.

None of old were wont to be Sprinkled, and (saith he) I confess my self unconvinced by Demonstration of Scripture for Infants Sprinkling. It ought to be the Churches Part to cleave to the Institution, which is Dipping. And he betrays the Church, whose Officer he is, to a disorder'd Error, if he cleave not to the Institution, which is to Dip. Rogers's *Treatise of the two Sacraments*, Part 1. Chap. 5.

The famous Reformer Luther.

Luther *de Baptismo*, Tom. 1. Fol. 71. in the Latin Edition, Printed at *Wittemburg*, saith, Baptism is a Greek word; it may be Translated a Dipping, when we dip something in Water, that it may be covered with Water. And although it be for the most part altogether abolished, for that they do not Dip the whole Children, but only Sprinkle them with a little Water, they ought nevertheless to be wholly Dipt, and presently to be drawn out again.

And in Tom. 2. Fol. 79. concerning *Babylon*'s Captivity. The other thing (saith he) which belongs to Baptism, is the Sign, or the Sacrament, which is the Dipping it self into the Water; from whence also it hath its Name. *Nam Baptizo Græce, Mergo Latine, & Baptisma Mersio est.* For *Baptizo* in Greek, is in Latin *Mergo*, to *Dip*; and *Baptisma*, is *Dipping*. And a little after, speaking of *Rom.* 6. 4. he saith, Being moved by this Reason, I would have those that are to be Baptized, to be *wholly* Dipt *into* the Water; as the word doth sound, and the Mystery doth signifie.

And when Complaint was made to him and other Divines at *Wittemburg*, That a Child had been Sprinkled at *Hamburgh*, and their Advice desired upon it; he wrote to *Hamburgh* to acquaint them, That their Use of Sprinkling was an Abuse, which they ought to remove. *Ita Mersionem* Hamburgi *restitutam esse.* So Dipping was restored at *Hamburgh*. *Author Joannes Bugenhagius Pomeranius*, in his Book Printed *Anno* 1542. He was Contemporary with, and a Successor of *Luther* at *Wittemburg*.

The

The Learned Grotius,

On *Matth.* 3. 6. *Mersatione autem, non perfusione agi solitum hunc ritum indicat & vocis proprietas, & loca ad eum ritum delecta*, John 3. 23. Acts 8. 38. *Et alluſiones multæ Apoſtolorum quæ ad aſperſionem referri non poſſunt*, Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12.

Mr. John Calvin,

On *John* 3. 23. Baptiſm was performed by *John* and *Chriſt*, by dipping of the whole Body in Water.

And in his Inſtitutions, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 15. *ſect.* 19. he ſaith thus, *Cæterum mergaturne totus qui tingitur, idque ter an ſemel, an infuſa tantum aqua aſpergatur, minimum refert: ſed id pro regionum diverſitate Eccleſiis liberum eſſe debet. Quanquam & ipſum baptizandi verbum mergere ſignificat, & mergendi ritum veteri Eccleſia obſervatum fuiſſe conſtat.*

Here you may ſee, that although he thinks it a thing indifferent whether it be done by Dipping or Sprinkling, and that thrice or once only; and that it's left to the Churches Liberty, according to the diverſity of Countries: yet he comes in at laſt with his *Quanquam*, notwithſtanding the word *Baptiſm* ſignifies *to Dip*, and it is evident that the Rite of Dipping was obſerved by the Old Church.

The Caſe is ſo clear (as a learned Writer hath noted) that *Calvin* up and down his Works doth often confeſs, that the ancient manner of Baptiſm in the Primitive times was by Dipping the whole Body *under* Water.

Piſcator

On *John* 3. 23. ſaith, That Baptiſm was performed by Dipping the whole Body *under* Water.

The Dutch *Tranſlators.*

Matth. 3. 1. *Joannes de Dooper*, John the Dipper, *Verſ.* 6. *Gedoopt in de Jordaen*, Dipt in Jordan. *Verſ.* 16. *Ende Jeſus gedoopt zynde opgecklommen uyt het water.* And Jeſus being Dipt, he (climbed or) came up out of the Water. *Matth.* 28. 19. *Onderwyſt alle de volckeren, deſelve dopende in den name des vaders*, &c. Inſtruct all the People, dipping the ſame in the name of the Fathers, *&c.* Mark 1. 9. *Ende wiert van Joanne gedoopt in de Jordaen, Ende terſtont als hy uyt het Water opklaem*, &c. And was dipt

dipt of *John* in *Jordan*. And straightways as he climbed up out of the Water, &c.

Acts 8. 36. *Wat verhindert my gedoopt te worden?* What hinders me to be dipt? v. 38. *Ende hy doopte hem.* And he dipt him. v. 12. *Wierden sy gedoopt beyde Mannen ende Vrouwen.* They were dipt both Men and Women.

Rom. 6. 3. *Ofte en wetet ghy niet dat soo vele als wy in Christum Jesum gedoopt zyn, wy in Synen doodt gedoopt zyn?* Know ye not that so many of us as were dipt into Christ Jesus, we were dipt into his Death? And the same in *Col.* 2. 12. And (according to what I find) in all other places where this Ordinance of Baptism is mentioned.

Dutch Annotations,

On *John* 3. 23. And *John* also Baptized in *Ænon* near *Salim*, &c. seeing there were many Waters there, that is Brooks or Rivelets, or much Water, because they that were Baptized by *John*, went into the Water with their whole Bodies. See *Matth.* 3. 16. *Acts* 8. 38.

And on *Rom.* 6. 3. *We are Baptized into his Death.* The Apostle seems here to allude to the manner of Baptizing much used in those warm Eastern Countries; where Men were wholly Dipt *into* the Water, and remained a little while *under* the Water; to shew that this Dipping *into*, and remaining *in* the Water, is a Representation of Christ's Death and Burial: and the rising up out of the Water, of his Resurrection.

Beza on *Matth.* 3. 11.

The Word Βαπτίζειν, signifies to die by dipping or washing, and differs from the Word Νίνειν, to drown, or go down to the bottom like a Stone.

Causabon's Annotations.

Upon *Matth.* 3. He saith, Immerging was the proper Rite in Baptism, which the Word it self sufficiently declares; which as it signifies not Νίνειν, a going down to the bottom without any ascending; so not ἐπιπολάζειν, a swimming like a Cork above the Water; but Βαπτίζειν, a going down and coming up again.

Tilenus,

Tilenus, *a Learned Proteſtant Writer,*

In his *Diſputation,* page 886, 889, 890. ſaith, Baptiſm is the firſt Sacrament of the *New Teſtament* Inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt.

The Outward Rite in Baptiſm is Three-fold.

Firſt, Immerſion into the Water.
2dly. Abiding *under* the Water.
3dly. A riſing again out of the Water.

And he there ſhews at large, what a moſt lively Similitude it is of the Sorrows of Chriſt which he was plung'd into under Divine Juſtice, and of his Burial and Reſurrection, *&c.*

Leigh, *in his* Critica Sacra.

He ſaith, Βαπτίζω, is derived from Βάπτω, *tingo;* to dip or plunge into the Water, and ſignifieth primarily ſuch a kind of waſhing as is uſed in *Bucks,* where Linen is plunged or dipt. It implieth the waſhing of their whole Body. The Native and Proper ſignification of it is, to dip into Water, or to plunge under Water, *John* 3. 22, 23. *Matth.* 3. 16. *Acts* 8. 38.

Βάπτισμα, Dipping into Water, or waſhing with Water, *&c.*

And in his *Annotations* on *Rom.* 6. 4. He alludes to the manner in which Baptiſm was *then* Adminiſtred, which was to plunge them in the Water; the plunging of them into Water that were Baptized, was a Sign of their Death and Burial with Chriſt.

Wollebius *in his* Compendium, *&c.*

Speaking of their preſent Practice, ſaith, The Action is ſprinkling of Water, which is uſurped in the ſtead of Dipping. And then adds, *Immerſio & emerſio illuſtre Symbolum fuit Sepulturæ & Reſurrectionis Chriſti.* Their being plunged into the Water, and coming up again out of the Water, was an Illuſtrious Symbol of the Burial and Reſurrection of Chriſt.

Daille, *on the Fathers.*

Lib. 2. p. 148. ſaith, It was a Cuſtom heretofore in the Ancient Church, to plunge thoſe they Baptized, over Head and Ears in the Water; and cites for his Authority, *Tertullian,*

Cyrian

Cyprian, *Epiphanius*, and others. And this is *ſtill* (ſaith he) the Practice both of the *Greeks* and *Ruſſians* to this Day. And Cites, *Caſſander de Baptiſmo*, p. 193. and yet notwithſtanding this Cuſtom, which is both ſo *Ancient* and ſo *Univerſal*, is now aboliſhed by the Church of *Rome*.

And this is the reaſon that the *Muſcovites* ſay that the *Latines* are not rightly and duly Baptized; becauſe they do not uſe this Ancient Ceremony in their Baptiſm.

Alſo, in that *Greek Lexicon*, Publiſhed and Recommended to all, for the encreaſe of Knowledge (and explained in *Engliſh*) by Mr. *Joſeph Caryll*, Mr. *George Cockayne*, Mr. *Ralph Vening*, Mr. *William Dell*, Mr. *Matthew Barker*, Mr. *William Adderly*, Mr. *Matthew Mead*, Mr. *Henry Jeſſey*. They render Βάπτω, to dip, plunge, or drown. In the paſſive Voice, Βάπτομαι, to be plunged, or overwhelmed. Ἐμβάπτω, to dip in, as one doth his Finger in Liquor. [*From this we may allow, that the Presbyterian Miniſters do Baptize their Fingers when they dip them into the Water: but cannot be ſaid to Baptize the Children, becauſe they do not dip them in the Water, but ſprinkle only a little Water upon their Faces.*] *Matt.* 26. 23. *John* 13. 26. *Mark* 14. 20. Βαπτίζω, to plunge, to overwhelm, to waſh, to dip, *Matth.* 3. 11. *John* 1. 25. Chap. 3. 26. *John* 4. 1. 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *John* 1. 31. *Matth.* 28. 19. *John* 3. 22. *John* 4. 2. Chap. 1. 28.

Βαπτίζομαι, to be Plunged, to be Baptized, or Dipt.

By a Metaphor, it's taken for Affliction, *Matth.* 20. 22. which is familiarly read in Scripture; whereby Afflictions are compared to the Gulphs and Whirl-Pools of Water, into which thoſe are plunged, who ſtruggle with the Miſeries and Calamities of this Life. Yet they are ſo plunged, that they can lift up themſelves again.

I might alſo add, what thoſe ſeveral great Maſters of the Greek Tongue, as *Scapula*, *Stephanus*, *Schrevelius*, and divers others, have ſaid concerning the Etymology thereof. But the Learned being ſo well acquainted therewith, I ſhall only touch upon it: They confirming what I have already obſerved from others. They tell us in their *Lexicons*, that Βαπτίζω, *&c.* from Βάπτω, ſignifies *mergo*, *immergo*, *ſubmergo*, *obruo*; *item tingo*, *quod fit immergendo*. To dip, to overwhelm, to plunge or dip in, to drown or ſink in the Water, to overwhelm, to dip, or plunge; to put under, to cover clean over, *&c.* And that Ῥαντίζω, *Rantizo*, is *Aſpergo*, to ſprinkle: Ῥαντισμὸς, *Aſperſio*, Sprinkling.

Now theſe two different Words, do ſignifie two different Actions: For he that is only ſprinkled, cannot be ſaid to be dipt, or plunged under the Water, and to come up again out of

of the Water, (when they were never in it) as those are said to do, in *Acts* 8. 38. They went both down *into* the Water, and they came up again *out* of the Water. Besides, I challenge all the Learned in the World to shew one Instance in the *New Testament*, that these words *Rantiso*, *Rantizmos*, or *Rantisma*, are ever made use of by the Spirit of God, to express that Ordinance of Baptism by. For they know right well that *Bapto*, and its Derivatives are always made use of to express it by. And where they are translated into English, the one is rendred Dipping, and the other Sprinkling. But if these Men will keep up a Practise contrary to Holy Scripture, and the Judgment of the most Learned *Lexicographers* and *Criticks* in the Greek Tongue, it's their own fault, and not ours.

The Assembly of Divines Annotations.

Acts 8. 38. They went both down into the Water.

They were wont to dip the *whole* Body, or go down into the Water, as here, and *Matth.* 3. 16.

And upon *Rom.* 6. 4. Buried with him by Baptism. See *Col.* 2. 12. In this Phrase the Apostle seemeth to allude to the *Ancient* Manner of Baptism; which was to Dip the Parties Baptized, and as it were, to bury them *under* the Water for a while, and then to draw them out of it, and lift them up; to represent the Burial of our Old Man, and our Resurrection to newness of Life.

The late Dr. *Gabriel Towerson* in his Explication of the Catechism of the Church of *England*, Part 4. pag. 20, *&c.* speaks largely upon it, in Vindication of the Rite of Dipping in Baptism; of which I shall recite some few Passages, and refer you to his Book for the rest.

Baptism is intended as a Sign, and that in respect of the Manner of Application used; I mean the diping, or plunging the Party Baptized in it. A signification which S. *Paul* will not suffer those to forget, who have been acquainted with his Epistles, for which he Quotes *Rom.* 6. 4. and *Col.* 2. 12. It was performed by the Ceremony of Immersion, that the Person Immersed, might by that Ceremony (which was no obscure Image of a Sepulture) be minded of the precedent Death, as in like manner by his coming again out of the Water, of his rising from that Death to Life, after the Example of the Institutor thereof.

Then he puts this Question, Whether it ought to be performed by an Immersion, or an Aspersion, *&c?*

His Answer is, It may be a more material Question than is commonly deemed by us who have been acustomed to Baptize by a bare Effusion and Sprinkling of Water upon the Party.

For things which depend for their force on the meer Will and Pleasure of him who Instituted them, there ought (no doubt) great regard to be had to the Commands of him that did so; as without which there is no reason we should receive the benefit of that Ceremony to which he has been pleased to annex it.

Now what the Command of Christ was in this particular, cannot be well doubted of by those who shall consider; First, The words of Christ, *Matth.* 28. 19. concerning it, and the Practice of those Times, whether in the Baptism of *John* or our Saviour; for the words of Christ are, *That they should Baptize or Dip those whom they made Disciples to him*; for (so no doubt) the word Βαπτίζοντες, *Baptizontes*, properly signifies: Though if there could be any doubt concerning the signification of the words themselves, yet would that doubt be removed by considering the Practice of those Times. For such as was the Practice of those times in Baptizing, such in reason we are to think our Saviours Command to have been concerning it, *&c.* there being not otherwise any means either for those, or future Times to discover his intention concerning it.

What the Practice of those Times were, will need no other proof, than the resorting to Rivers and other such Receptacles of Water for the performance of that Ceremony, as that because there was much Water there, *Matth.* 3. 5. *John* 3. 23. And the Scripture expressly affirming concerning the Baptism of the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. 38. That *Philip* and the Eunuch went both down into a certain Water (which they met with in their Journey) in order to the Baptizing of the latter.

For what need would there have been of the Baptists resorting to great Confluxes of Water; or of *Philip*'s and the Eunuch's going down *into* this, were it not that the Baptism both of the one and of the other, were to be performed by an Immersion; a very little Water (as we know it doth with us) sufficing for an Effusion or Sprinkling.

The same is to be said yet more, upon the account of our conforming to the Death and Resurrection of Christ, which we learn from S. *Paul* to be the design of Baptism to signifie, for though that might, and was well enough represented by the Baptized Persons being buried in Baptism, and their rising

out

out of it; yet can it not be said to be so, or at least but very imperfectly, by the bare pouring out, or sprinkling the Baptismal Water on him.'

But therefore; as there is so much the more Reason to represent the Rite of Immersion as the *Only* Legitimate Rite of Baptism, because the *Only One* that can answer the ends of its Institution, and those things that were to be signified by it; so especially, if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of great force) the general Practice of the Primitive Church was agreeable thereto, and the Greek Church to this every Day: for who can think that either the one, or the other, would have been so tenacious of so troublesome a Rite, were it not that they were well assured (as they of the Primitive Church might very well be) of its being the *Only* Instituted and Legitimate One. I cannot but think the forementioned Arguments to be so far of force, as to envince the necessity thereof, *&c.* For what benefit can Men ordinarily expect from that which depends for its force upon the Will of him that Instituted it; where there is no such compliance in the least with it, and the Command of the Institutor; as may answer those ends for which he applied it.

Dr. Barlow, *late Bishop of* Lincoln, *in his Letter to Mr.* John Tombs, *Printed in his Life-time and owned by him.*

He saith thus; I believe and know, that there is neither Precept nor Practice in the Scripture for Pædo-Baptism; nor any just Evidence for it, for about two hundred Years after Christ. Sure I am, that in the Primitive Times they were to be *Catechumeni*, and then *Illuminati*, or *Baptizati*: And this not only Children of Pagans, or Pagans Converted; but Children of Christian Parents. *Nazianzen*, though a Bishop's Son, being not Baptized till he was about Thirty Years of Age, as appears in his Life. And the like is evident in some others.

I have seen what my Learned and Worthy Friend Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Baxter*, and others, say in defence of it; and I confess I wonder not a little, that Men of such Parts should say so much to so little purpose: For I have not seen any thing like an Argument for it.

I shall add no more, but my hearty Wishes, That as God was pleased to make the Hearing of the Dispute, of such use to several Persons, that they were fully convinced (by the Grace of God towards them) of the Truth of the Doctrine of Holy Baptism, and did in few days after submit [illegible]

selves to be Dipt in Water, upon Profession of their Faith, according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, That it may also be of the like use to many others, in the Reading of it; that so there may be added to the Church daily, such as shall be Saved. And then my design will be answered in its Publication; and I shall count it a sufficient Reward for all my Pains and Labour therein.

FINIS.